Impedit ira animum,

OR

ANIMADVERSIONS VPON SOME OF THE LOOSER AND FOVLER PASSAGES IN A WRITTEN PAMPHLET INTITVLED, A DEFENCE OF THE TRUE SENCE AND meaning of the words of the holy Apoſtle.

Romans 4. *ver.* 3. 5. &c.

First diſperſed in ſeverall copies without the Authors Name, but ſince acknowledged and triumphed in, by M^r. *George Walker.*

By IOHN GOODVVIN.

But this I confeſſe unto thee, that after the way which they call Hereſie, So worſhip I the God of my Fathers, beleeving all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets, Act. 24. 14.

He that is firſt in his owne cauſe, ſeemeth juſt, but his neighbour commeth and ſearcheth him. Prov. 18. 17.

Make no friendſhip with an angry man, neither goe with the furious man, leſt thou learne his waies, and get a ſnare to thy ſoule, Prov. 22. 24, 25.

Molitúrque Genus poenæ miſerabile, ſi non
Ille ſuis eſſet nulli miſerabilis actis, *Ovid. Met.*

Printed in the yeare 1641.

OR

ANIMADVERSIONS
UPON SOME OF THE

A DEFENCE OF THE TRUE SENSE AND

BODLEIAN
20-6-1907
LIBRARY

SOME

CHOYCE FLOVVERS

OF MASTER WALKERS RHETORICKE FOR THE READER TO SMELL ON BY THE WAY.

THe Confutation of the falſe expoſition made by Socinus, *and other Heretikes his Diſciples, as* Wotton, Goodwin, *and their companions.* pag. 18.

His Socinian *Diſcourſe.* pag. 26.

He ſhewes himſelfe as bold in affirming untruths, as ignorant both of Rhetoricke and Logicke. pag. 28.

A more odious example of impudencie and follie cannot bee imagined, then hee here makes himſelfe, by making his folly and abſurditie to ſtrive for maſterſhip with his impudence. pag. 42.

Thus he ſtraine fully trifles to ſhew his impudencie and perverſeneſſe. pag. 40.

This his confeſſion is not out of humilitie and modeſtie, but out of Satanicall ſubtiltie, to vent his poyſonfull lies under the perſon of another, as the Devill did vent his by the Serpent. pag. 40.

I eaſily gather from his impudent boldneſſe. ibidem. *And a little after his impudent boaſting.*

He ſhewes himſelfe a bold lying Sophiſter. pag 29.

Here we have a heape of lies mixt with contradictions. pag. 31.

Here like a mad or drunken man, he contradicts himſelfe. ibid.

His words are moſt wicked and blaſphemous. pag. 32.

This opinion being built upon ſuch hereticall and blaſphemous

grounds, and maintained by ſuch blaſphemous arguments, muſt needes be moſt impious, hereticall, and blaſphemous. pag. 26.

I will not have ſuch a forger and falſe ſuborner of witneſſes to goe away without the brand of forgerie, and notorious impudencie, pag. 43.

The very Father of lyers, the Devill himſelfe, ſhould if not bluſh and be aſhamed, yet in policie be afraid to call Calvin *for a witneſſe, leſt all that heare him, ſhould hate and hiſſe him for his open lying.* p. 50.

Let zealous Chriſtians conſider, whether it bee not their dutie, both to take heede to themſelves, and admoniſh others, that they have no fellowſhip with ſo openly profeſt Socinian Sectaries, as this man and his followers are: you ſee the Doctrine they maintaine is wicked and blaſphemous Hereſie: And preſently after, they ſtill perſiſt in their peſtilent hereſie, and are more mad to maintaine and diſperſe it, — they flee for helpe to the Father of lie: and in forging lies they ſinne, being condemned of themſelves againſt their knowledge & conſcience, as the Apoſtle foretold concerning Heretickes. And againe immediately after: How wilfully againſt the knowne truth, and his owne conſcience, this deſperate man hath proclamed Luther, *&c. Againe: As for his rude, impudent, and unmannerly followers, their owne lying and ſlanderous tongues proclame their pedigree from the Father of lyers.* pag. 55. *From ſuch lying ſpirits, &c.* pag. ult.

Thus you ſee how he hath bent his tongue and pen like a bow for lies, and ſhoots them forth thicke and threefold like poyſoned arrowes, as if his quiver were the armory of the Father of lyars, the Prince of darkeneſſe. pag. 35.

THE

THE PREFACE.

SOme weekes ſince there was ſent unto mee, from a worthy Gentleman (a friend of mine) a Tract in writing, of ſomewhat a diſtracted ſubject, method, and expreſſion, without any Authors name unto it. Though I could not then be ſo confident, that Maſter *Walker* was the Authour, as I then was, (and ſtill am) that the opinion (whatſoever it be) that ſeekes maintenance in it, but findes none, is a ſupine & fond errour (I forbeare to call it Hereſie, Blaſphemie, or the like, leſt my Antagoniſt knowing ſo well my ignorance in Rhetoricke, ſhould boaſt, that I was beholding to him for his) yet had I a very reaſonable and ſtrong perſwaſion, that he was the man, and no other. And this I was induced to beleeve, the rather (beſides divers other grounds of this apprehenſion) becauſe I finde the image and character of the man, ſo fairely and ſignificantly ſtamped upon it, viz. words, and paſſion. *Nec lac lacti, nec ovo ovum ſimilius: vnum qui nôrit, ambos noverit.*

Not milke to milke, nor egg to egg more like,
Then booke to man, and man againe to booke.

Some monethes before, upon the clamorous, unceſſant, and inſulting importunity of ſome, who were confident (it ſeemes) of finding ſhelter under M^r. *W^n.* wing for ſome opinions they held and loved dearely (though they little deſerved it) and would not truſt ſo bad a cauſe in the hand of any other Champion (their owne word and ſtile they gave him) I was requeſted and much preſſed from time to time by ſome of my acquaintance, that if I could at any time ſpare a day, I would goe over to M^r. *W.* to conſider and rea-

ſon ſome points, depending (as it ſeemed) in ſharpe diſpute among themſelves. Why Mr. W. amongſt all the Divines in Citie or Countrey, ſhould be ſo importunely pitched upon by thoſe men, I leave to thoſe that know him, to conſider: onely thus farre (as I was informed) they diſcovered themſelves, that they little thought or expected, I either would or durſt looke ſuch a champion as he in the face. In which conceipt of my unwillingneſſe & fearefulneſſe to appeare before him, Mr. W. himſelfe was partaker with them, and loſt a wager of five ſhillings (as himſelfe confeſſed) upon it. Whereby it appeares, that theſe men had ſuch an opinion or hope of him, that there was ſome knowne propertie in him, which ſhould make ſober men and of few words afraid to come neere him in a way of diſputation; which whether it bee the depth of his learning, the ſharpeneſſe of his wit, activeneſſe in diſputing, or ſome other thing, I will not divine, but had rather others ſhould conjecture, then I determine. At laſt (not without much gaineſaying from my other occaſions and imployments) I ſacrificed a day upon the ſervice of Mr W. reputation, and went to him, to conferre with him about the points in queſtion betweene his friends and mine, and to receive further information from him therein, if hee had had any of this commodity in his hand. But my going to him was upon the ſame termes, and with like ſucceſſe that Chriſt went to the figtree, *Mat.* 21. who found no fruit thereon, but leaves onely. The conference betweene us being managed in a tumultuous and iſſueleſſe manner, the one of us ſtill carrying aſide the ſtate of the Queſtion, and hiding it in a great thicket and wilderneſſe of words, and no waies willing to heare or underſtand, what the opinion was, wherein ſatisfaction was deſired: I was deſired at laſt, both by Mr. W. owne brother, (the Miniſter of the place, in whoſe houſe wee were) and by divers others unknowne to me then preſent (well-willers, as I conceived, both to peace and truth) to leave ſomething in writing, whereby the ſtate of the queſtion or controvertie betweene us, might be the more ſteadily and diſtinctly knowne and judged of. The day being farre ſpent, and opportunity otherwiſe wanting for ſetting downe

then

then in writing, what I judged convenient and neceſſary for ſuch a purpoſe, and having caſually about me a paper of ſome collections I had formerly made concerning the interpretatiõ of ſuch paſſages in the fourth chapter to the *Romans*, as concerned the buſineſſe betweene us, this *I* left behind me, with a faire and ingenuous promiſe and proteſtation, that if either M^r. *W.* or any other, could give me a diſtinct and cleare accompt, how thoſe paſſages might with any tollerable congruity of reaſon and conſiſtence with other Scriptures of like argument, bee carried in their interpretation, to comply with the opinion held by ſome againſt me; I would willingly acknowledge any ſuch ſatisfaction, and let my preſent judgement and opinion fall. Therefore whereas M^r. *W.* complaines page 27. of his diſcourſe (as of ſome injurie done to him, or affront put upon him) that hee ſhould bee challenged to anſwer thoſe reaſons I left with him, I dare not abſolutely deny, himſelfe affirming it, but that hee might bee challenged (leaſt ignorance, impudence, lying, hereſie, blaſphemie and ſuch furies, M^r. *W.* familiars, ſhould preſently be about my eares for it) but this I confidently affirme (yet without any impudence at all) that if M^r. *W.* were ſo challenged, it was by him, who long ſince appeared to *Saul* in *Samuells* likeneſſe, and of late (it ſeemes) hath appeared to M^r. *W.* and given him this challenge. Thoſe few notes I left with him, have proved very fruitfull and generative: they are returned into my boſome with an abundant increaſe. Yet unhappy they have been in their propagation: they have not begotten in their image or likeneſſe. I doe not remember that any one line amongſt them was poſſeſſed with any ſuch tragicall, truculent or Gorgonean ſpirit, as breathes fire & furie in a great part of that long diſcourſe occaſioned by them. Why M^r. *W.* ſhould write ſo much upon ſo ſmall an occaſion, I impute to the abundance of his time and leaſure above mine, who may (I conceive) drop weekes and moneths againſt my houres, in the fulneſſe of an eſtate temperance (we know) is more then an ordinary vertue. Why he ſhould write ſo much to ſo little purpoſe, I am loath to impute to any infirmitie or defect in him, whereby he ſhould be diſabled

from

from diſcerning, when either himſelfe or others, ſpeake ſhells, or kernells: I will rather impute it to ſome ſuch politique and profound reach in him as this; knowing my leaſure to be little to attend ſuch eccentricall & by-buſineſſe as this is, his device might be to oppreſſe and overcharge my time with reading, that ſo I might be ſtraightned, if not wholly cut off from anſwering. And the truth is, that the bulkineſſe or body of the diſcourſe, is the life and ſoule of it, it being more troubleſome to reade, then to anſwer. But what ſhould ſo tranſcendently ſublimate the choler of the man, to raile right downe ſuch milſtones of obloquies, reproches, calumnies, curſes upon my head, I cannot imagine; except it were the faireneſſe of my writing, and fewneſſe of my words when I was with him: both which having an energeticall and pregnant antipathy to an angry temper, and talking diſpoſition, might (I confeſſe) by way of an antiperiſtaſis, provoke and inflame their contrary natures in him. Other cauſe (beſides theſe) on my part, I verily know none, except (happily) that alſo might be a ſparke falling into his gunpowder, that I deſired him once and againe, when we were together, that hee would clearely and diſtinctly lay downe, what his opinion was, in oppoſition to what was maintained by me. Himſelfe indeede, in the preſence of ſome both of his friends and mine, (who were partly requeſted, and partly offered themſelves to goe over to him, to mediate with him for a peace, or at leſt for termes of a fairer warre, after he had begunne the fight in this furious manner) drew the pedegree and royall deſcent of his quarrell againſt me, from an ancient meeting betweene us in *Cheap-ſide*, ſome three or foure yeares ſince (to my remembrance, I know not how long before any thing was thought of concerning the diſpute now depending) at which meeting (as the partie aggrieved in effect complaineth) I did not doe my homage to his diſcourſe with that reverence and gravity which became me, but either ſmiled or laughed at it; I am not conſcious to my ſelf of any ſuch prodigious overſight, but ſince I was challenged for it, I have enquired after my error by as many as I have met with, of thoſe that were then preſent with us, and can heare no tydings of it at any hand.

If

If I had made any breach upon Mr. W. reputation, either in that kinde or in any other, upon conviction, I should have been ready (and still am) to have repaired it with the best of mine owne. But I feare, Mr. W. had rather take revenge, then satisfaction: and by his owne confession of the roote and originall of his quarrell against me, it may easily be perceived, how good and faithfull a treasurer he is of the black Princes coyne; these three or foure yeares together he hath sat brooding a Cockatrice egge, and now at last the fiery flying Serpent is come forth. But this by the way. At my late being with him about the point in Question, in stead of cleering his opinion, when he was desired and pressed thereunto, he still interposed a dark cloud of words, and quite buried his minde under his tongue. And when wee should have met about our businesse in the East, and were upon the point of grapling and closing, he immediately hoyseth up sayle, and tacks about againe to the West, as if he had been affrighted with his owne opinion or shadow, and had resolved never to come neere it. And to this day, what his opinion cleerly is in opposition to me in this controversie, I am at perfect peace in my thoughts, that himselfe yet understandeth not. I have this ground (among others) for what I say, because a man may as well find a needle in a bottle of hay, as finde any such opinion, either cleered, or constantly maintained, in this his discourse, which yet was penned by him purposely in confutation of my (erroneously so called) errour. Surely his opinion, (what ever It be) is very melancholique, and (according to the character of that humour) ὁ θεὸς, ὁ θηρίον, either a God, or a beast. And he deales by it accordingly: for he onely shewes the backside of it to the world, and is either ashamed to have the feature, shape, and face of it seene, as if it were some Monster: or else he judgeth the world, either unworthy or unable, to behold the glory of it, and so meant tacitely to insinuate some *Numen* or Deitie in it. ——— νεμεσσητὸν δὲ κεν εἴη

Ἀθάνατον θεὸν ὧδε βροτοῖς ἀναφαίνεμεν ἄντην:

That is;

Too high a grace it were, for mortalls e're to see
A God immortall, in such perfect view.

 I will

I will first tell you, what I call the backside of his opinion: and then what I meane by the fore-side, or face. The backside of his opinion, I call those generall, lax, and wide expressions, wherein (and wherein onely) he expresseth himselfe in his discourse, as, *viz.* That Beleevers have communion with Christ; That Faith is not our Righteousnesse; that the righteousnesse and satisfaction of Christ are imputed to us; that we are justified by Christs righteousnesse, and such like. In which positions, if his meaning be no worse then his words (though some of them be incommodious, & of no affinitie with Scripture expressions in this point) I neither ever was, nor yet am, nor (I hope) ever shall be an adversary to him. I call these the backside of his opinion, because they doe onely in a generall, confused, and indistinct manner represent his judgement in this controversie, and upon such termes, that a man may easily carry away his words, and yet leave his opinion behind him, as it is an easie matter to mistake one man for another, when their backs onely are toward us. But 2°, if Master *Walker* had any mind to shew us the face of his opinion, he should tell us distinctly, roundly, and plainly, what righteousnesse of Christ he means should be imputed to us for righteousnesse, and how, and after what manner, and upon what termes it is imputed, as *viz.* Whether by vertue of such imputation, a man be made legally righteous, so that he may claime Heaven in right of the first Covenant, *Doe this and live*: or whither, by Christs righteousnesse imputed to us, he meanes nothing else, but our being justified by the vertue or merit of those things, which Christ hath done and suffered for us? He that doth not in this controversie, punctually, and precisely explaine himselfe, in these particulars, rather conceales and covers, then discovers his opinion. If M. *W.* at any time seemes to make some slender explication of himselfe in some of these particulars, he soone misfigures againe his owne expression with words of manifest inconsistency therewith: so that the setled judgement of the Author in the Question controverted, must be some where else inquired after, then in his discourse: This I can say of mine own knowledge, that when I was with him, pressing him to know, whither by the righteousnesse of Christ

(in

(in his opinion) he meant the righteousneſſe of his nature, conſiſting of inward habits or diſpoſitions of grace and holineſſe; or the righteouſneſſe of his life, conſiſting of thoſe righteous acts, which he performed in obedience to the Law of God, or whither he included them both, he abſolutely denied, that he meant either the one or the other, or both together. The ſame deniall, I heard, he had formerly made to another (who put the ſame, or like queſtion to him) with ſome ill language uttered againſt me, that I ſhould goe about to perſwade my followers, that either he or any other of his judgement in this queſtion, ſhould ſo conceive. Being further preſſed to declare himſelfe, whither his meaning then was, that any ſuch righteouſneſſe of Chriſt were imputed to us, which Chriſt himſelfe never had (no other righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, either as man, or Mediator, being imaginable but onely the two former) here he brake off with ſome ſuch ſhuffling expreſſion as this, that he held, it was a humane righteouſneſſe that was imputed from Chriſt unto us, and would heare no more on that eare. If any man out of all this, and ten times more in his diſcourſe to helpe him, can make out the riddle of Mr W. opinion, I doe not envie him the myſtery of his knowledge: but for my part (whither it be my ignorance in Logique, or in Rhetorique, I cannot tell) my ſoule cannot find the way to enter into his ſecret. The beſt that I can make of his opinion, from his words and writings together, is this; that that Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, which was none of Chriſts righteouſneſſe, is imputed to us for our righteouſneſſe, in our juſtification. Which concluſion if he can fetch off roundly, and like a man, from the Scriptures, I preſently yeeld him the Bucklers, and will be no longer his corrivall —— *Sed Phillida ſolus habebit*: that is, *He ſhall faire Phillis have alone.*

I deny not, but ſome may poſſibly be convinc'd and ſatiſfied by his diſcourſe: but certainly, they muſt be ſuch as ſtand in a precipitate and headlong diſpoſition to his opinion before hand. I proteſſe, I ſcarce ever met with any man, that being ſo weake and contemptible in his premiſſes, fell ſo ſore and heavy in his concluſions. I acknowledge that going about to reply, I tranſgereſſe a grave precept which I learn'd

long ſince out of *Cato* —— *Contra verboſos noli contendere verbis*; Which may be well enough tranſlated in our Engliſh Proverb, *It is no gaping againſt an Oven.* Notwithſtanding, becauſe ſuch a truth of God, as occaſioned that loud diſcourſe is above the ſphere of *Cato's* wiſdome or precepts, I have rather choſen to endanger my ſelfe the ſecond time, for the honour and preſervation thereof, then to provide for mine owne peace or repute, by betraying ſuch a piece of Heaven into the hand of an enemy. I confeſſe, I never yet made tryall of my ſtrength, in ſhooting in M^r. *W^n.* bow, (I meane in rayling and reviling) neither am I ſo in love with the exerciſe, that I ſhould intend ever to doe it: yet, me thinks, if I would ſet to it, I could draw an arrow as neere the head in it, as M^r. *W.* himſelfe hath done: or if my owne ſtrength and abilitie in this ſhould fayle me, I make no queſtion, but I might have ready aſſiſtance from him, who (I dare ſay) hath not ſtood at my adverſaries right hand to reſiſt him in that ſervice he hath done againſt God and his truth, in this expedition. But the truth, neither deſireth nor needeth any goods ſo ill gotten. What depths of learning, wit or judgement, men of more raiſed underſtandings and ſublimated apprehenſions may finde, in that boyſterous, unchriſtian, and inhumane Dialect, meeter for the diſputes of *Jjm* and *Oijm*, then for theirs that call themſelves the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, wherein his diſcourſe is written, I know not: neither doe I deſire to damnifie or prejudice M^r. *W.* in any part of his reputation with ſuch men. But for my ſelfe, I looke and looke as narrowly, as unpartially as I can, and yet can find no depths in ſuch learning, but onely the depths of *Machiavell.* Indeed his beloved Maxime, in caſe of oppoſition was; *Calumniare audaciter, aliquid harebit*, that is, Calumniate thy adverſary ſtoutly; ſomething will ſtick by him in deſpite of him, let him doe what he can to wipe it off. But otherwiſe, for matter of learning, who knows not, that the weakeſt braine in both Univerſities, is as able as M^r. *W.* himſelfe, to cry out againſt any man, *Sociniam, Arminian, ignorant, impudent, lyar, lying Sophiſter, Heretique, Blaſphemer, a man of a Satanicall ſpirit*, &c. The Scribes and Phariſees had no fellowes, in traducing Chriſt himſelfe, for a ſeducer,

cer, a deceiver, a Blaſphemer, a Bellzebub. A man needs not have a great ſtudy full of bookes nor looke pale and wan with much reading or ſtudying, to furniſh himſelfe with foule language; birds of this feather will come flying faſt enough without a ſcrapp. *ſcrap*

When I left my papers with Mr. *W.* I was in hope, that I had put my ſelfe into the hand of a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt, which though I dare not yet denie him to be, yet in the favourableſt conſtruction that can bee made of his proceedings, he is one of the ſtrangeſt Miniſters of Chriſt that a man ſhall lightly heare of. That a Miniſter of Satan ſhould transforme himſelfe into an Angell of light (as *Paul* ſpeaketh) holds a rationall proportion and conſiſtence, both with the ſhame and reproach of ſinne, and with the glory of righteouſneſſe: neither is it much to bee marvelled at, that men ſhould ſeeke to hide deformitie under an appearance of lovelineſſe and beauty. But that a Miniſter of Chriſt ſhould transforme himſelfe into the likeneſſe of an Angel of darkeneſſe, and beſmeare the brightneſſe of his face with the greaſe and ſoote of hell, is the moſt unnaturall metamorphoſis that ever was heard of.

When *Michael* the Archangell diſputed with the Devill about the body of *Moſes*, hee durſt not bring againſt him a railing accuſation. *Jude* verſe 9. Therefore (doubtleſſe) Mr. *W.* muſt either make himſelfe greater then the *Archangel*, or me worſe then the Devill, or both; or elſe he hath foulely miſcarried in a great and weighty duty of Chriſtianity. It may be he can deliver himſelfe roundly without any ſcruple of conſcience, out of theſe ſtraights: it is but thruſting mee downe a degree beneath Lucifer, and then his mouth is wiped cleane, he hath done nothing. God forbid that I ſhould upbraid any man with his ſufferings: God and Mr. *W.* and ſome other good enemie-friends, have put me (of late) into the liverie of the company of ſufferers; but I ſee that it was not the croſſe that *Dyſmas* (if that was his name) hung on, that brought him to repentance, but hee that was crucified with him. And *Cyprian* reports of ſome that had ſuffered, who grew worſe and more inſolent afterwards.

If Mr. *W.* had an intent or deſire to have gained ground upon me, or led me away in triumph, hee was quite miſtaken in the method of his warre. Five ſober words well ballanced with reaſon and underſtanding, would have gone further with me, and wounded me deeper then a thouſand crackers, or the raging, reaſonleſſe, roarings of ten thouſand Belzeebubs. I regard no more the rage or rubbidge of any mans tongue, (though in many degrees of outward greatneſſe and power, Mr. *W.* ſuperiour) then I doe the dung that paſſeth from him. But if any man ſpeakes reaſon (though he bee as many degrees his inferiour) I am ready to tremble, and to doe him reverence. Therefore Mr. *W.* might have kept his earth-quakes and whirlewinds and fires, and ſold them for bugbeares to ſcare children: his ſtill voyce would ſoone have layed mee at his feet. I dare not (indeede) deale with him, or anſwer him at his owne weapon (I meane railing) how ever provoked: the yoke that Chriſt hath put about my necke to keepe me in compaſſe this way, I dare not breake nor caſt from mee. Neither doe I know any example in all the Hiſtorie of Heaven, that would beare mee out in ſuch a practiſe And therefore I heare promiſe him (and will keepe promiſe too, for his learning) that throughout all my Reply, I will neither call him Socinian, nor Arminian, nor Hereticke, nor Blaſphemer, nor Lyer, nor lying Sophiſter, nor Impudent fellow, or the like. It may be I may now and then (but very rarely) adminiſter the infuſion of ſome of theſe ſimples, but will never give the groſſe ſubſtance I ſhall deale with him in a more ingenuous way. I hope, that having taken a liberty in folio to ſpeake evill of me undeſervedly, hee will not be a man of ſo hard a conſcience, as not to give me leave in *decimo ſexto* to make merry with him. If hee gives mee gall and vinegar to drinke, and I requite him with pleſant wine, I truſt hee ſhall have no cauſe (in the judgement of any reaſonable man to complaine.) Though I cannot meete with any faithfull ſervant of God in all that long roade that lyeth betweene *Geneſis* the firſt, and the firſt, and *Revelations* the laſt, and the laſt, in a railing or reviling poſture, but onely *Shimei's*, *Rabſecah's*, and ſuch like ſons of *Belial*: Yet I finde that holy ſtrict and

ſevere

ſevere Prophet himſelfe (*Elijah* I meane) in ~~preſent~~ pleasant diſcourſe with the ſleepie God *Baal*, and his zealous and flaſhing Prieſts, 1 *Kings* 18. 17. And *David* (wee know) had many troubles, trialls, difficulties, dangers, preſſures, *Doegs*, *Achitophels*, tongues as ſharpe as raſors, and that cut like ſwords upon him, from time to time: yet hee contriv'd all into matter of muſicke and ſonge, and played them off upon his Harpe. There was a ſpeciall neceſſity lying upon mee, to carry this buſineſſe recreation-wiſe (as neere as I could) becauſe I had little other tyme for the diſpatch of it, then what my health repui ed of me in ſome way of reſpiration & refreſhing from my conſtant and ſtanding labour. —— *Quanquam ridentem dicere verum*, —— *Quid vetat?* that is;

A man in mirth the truth may ſay,
As well as in a ſadder way.

My firſt thoughts were upon the firſt ſight and appearance of my adverſaries blacke Genius, onely to have reprooved and chide Sathan (for the worke he had made) and to have let M^r. *W.* alone, onely preſenting him with thoſe words from the mouth of an Archangell, Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος. The Lord rebuke thee. But conſidering that ſome of his readers (for the citie I heard ran quicke betymes with the diſperſed copies of his moſt vincible Anſwer) before my turne came to ſee it, might (haply) bee ſo farre miſtaken in him, as to thinke him *Iupiter*, becauſe of the terrible appearance of his thunder and lightning, and not *Salmoneus* the Iugler.

Qui tonitru Iovis, & flammas imitatur Olympi, that is;

Who counterfeits the cracks of thundring Iove,
And flaſhing flames of the th' Heavens from above:

I thought it the ſafer way, and wherein the truth might ſuffer leſſe, to be ſomewhat larger, and to give the world a taſt of his deepe non-ſight in the Queſtion under diſpute, and of his truth and faithfulneſſe in theſe proceedings. The law a-

greed

greed upon for this diſpute betweene us (as I thinke Mr. W. his brother remembreth, who either was himſelfe the firſt propounder and mover for it, or elſe ſome other Miniſter then in preſence with us) was that paſſages ſhould be private betweene our ſelves, and not communicated *ad extra*: yet divers weekes, before mine eyes could ſee, mine eares heard, that Mr. W. pictures (I meane the coppie of his pamphlet) were up and downe the citie in ſeverall hands, his picture in gold, and mine in lead at his feet. Yet in this I can partly excuſe him: for being naturally a ſub-angry man, it is like that his promiſe and hee fell out by the way, and were at odds, and ſo could not walke together to their journeyes end.

For my method in tranſacting this buſineſſe with him, I ſhall not ſtrike, as oft as I finde him naked: I ſhould then overcharge my Reader, with inke and paper, (whatſoever I have done now) which is a preſſure I have ſufferd my ſelfe under him. I may cover a multitude of infirmities, and yet have ſufficient to worke upon beſides. I ſhall onely here and there, where the occaſion is the ranker, apply ſome animadverſions: yet ſo, that the Reader ſhall finde every thing that deſerves an anſwer (yea, and many things, which indeede deſerved it not) fully ſifted and examined. In theſe my animadverſions, I ſtill make reference (in the margin) to the ſeverall paſſages of that copie of his Anſwer, which was ſent unto mee, for the finding out thoſe paſſages, to which I doe more particularly frame my reply. And were it not for labour or charge of writing, I could wiſh that hee that ſhall pleaſe to peruſe theſe notes and obſervations upon his Anſwer, might have a copy of the Anſwer it ſelfe by him, to read (occaſionally) the entire paſſages of things there, which I was loath to tranſcribe at large in my reply. Notwithſtanding to ſave my Reader that labour and charge, without any materiall loſſe or damage of the matters betweene us, I have tranſcribed many things *verbatim* out of the anſwer, from place to place; which makes my Reply ſo much the more bulkie, and overladen with words.

passes

Vpon the receipt of his Anſwer, before I proceeded in this Reply,

Reply, I wrote a letter to him by ſome of my friends, partly to know the certaintie concerning the Anſwer, whether he would owne it, or no: partly to give him a friendly opportunity and intimation of making cleane where he had fouled therein (I meane of retracting his foule and unſeemely language) before my pen came to tread in it, and ſo to make it ſtinck to his ſhame and infamie in the world. The copie of which letter I have here tranſcribed immediately after this preface. But as *David* complained of his enemies, that they rewarded him evill for good, to the ſpoyling of his ſoule, *Pſalme* 35. ſo my ſevere and implacable adverſarie, Meſech-like, when I was for peace, he was for warre: and in ſtead of the leaſt relenting of his diſcrologie, or any waies comporting with my motion that way, he entertayned the Meſſengers that were ſent unto him, with ſuch magnificent preſents of further railing, reviling, & horrid imputations againſt me, as if he had been newly returned from the ſlaughter of *Rabſecah*, or had the ſame day divided the ſpoyles of hell. My deſire and intent is, rather to make merry with my Antagoniſt, then to complie with him in his paſſion, or to be angry, becauſe he is angry: yet I know not, whether it may not bee the greater rack and torture to him, to bee put to it to be angry alone. aiſchrologie

The great God of Heaven and earth, by whom I muſt bee judged (and that I know not how ſoone or ſuddenly) as well concerning my carriage in this buſineſſe, as the other acts of my life, knoweth that I ſtand cleare and free in my heart and ſpirit to the man (notwithſtanding his ſeven fold provocation) wiſhing him no more evill, then I doe to my ſelfe, or my own ſoule, and am ready at an houre, upon the acknowledgement of his overſight, to give him the right hand of fellowſhip at any time. Onely having wronged the truth (as hee hath done) it cannot be but ſuch injuries will be chargeable to him: howſoever, Repentance will bring him into his owne againe, with advantage.

The Copie of my Letter ſent to Mr. *Walker*, upon the Receipt of his Anſwer, ſeeking either peace from him, or a faire warre.

SIR, a few dayes ſince there was ſent unto me, from a Gentleman (a Friend and Neighbour of mine) a Manuſcript of about 21 leaves in quarto, which though I have not yet had time (by reaſon of full imployments otherwiſe) fully to peruſe, yet caſting my eye here and there, by ſome paſſages I conjecture the piece to be yours. Wherein alſo I am ſomewhat the further confirmed, by the common rumor abroad in the Citie, and which came to my eares ſeverall weeks, before I Received the Writing, that your Anſwer to my Reaſons, were in the hands of many. Yet two things there are, that make me at ſome ſtand in my thoughts, whither the diſcourſe be yours, or no; at leaſt, whither it be come to me, as it came from you; or whither rather it be not ſome Libell, wherein both you and my ſelfe may be abuſed together. The one is, becauſe there is no name at all of any Author put to it: which (you know) is Libell-like. The other is, the many veins of unſavoury and foule language, which run here and there through the body of the Diſcourſe. If the piece be yours, I cannot but ſuſpect, that your Scribe, to whom you committed the tranſcribing of it, hath ſome wayes wronged you, by mingling your milk with blood,

blood, and defacing your intellectualls, with his patheticalls. It will not readily enter into me, that ſo uneven and courſe a thrid ſhould be of Mr Walkers *ſpinning. Wherefore my requeſt in love to you is, that you will pleaſe to ſignifie, either by writing or otherwiſe; whither the diſcourſe be yours, or no, whole and intire, good and bad together, as it came to my hands: or whither onely that which is ſomewhat rationall and Chriſtian in it, be yours: but for the rough Turkie dialect, as, Socinian, Arminian, lyar, lying Sophiſter, impudent fellow, Heretique, Blaſphemer, a man of a Satanicall ſpirit,* cum id genus monſtris, *you are willing to diſavow. Becauſe, that if there be a neceſſitie, that for the truths ſake, I muſt have warres with you, I deſire they may be Chriſtian and fayre, ſuch as may tend to eſtabliſh and ſettle the truth in peace, with as little blood-ſhed of the names and reputations of the Combatants, as may be. Thus deſiring you to ſend me backe the Paper I left in your hands, with the tender of my reſpects and love unto you, I recommend you to the grace and love of God in his Chriſt.*

Your loving Brother in the work

of Jeſus Chriſt;

J. G.

ANIMADVERSIONS

Vpon ſome of the looſer and fowler paſſages in Mr. WALKERS *Diſcourſe* entitled, A DEFENCE of the true ſence and meaning of the words of the holy *Apoſtle, Rom.* 4. 3. 5. 9. *&c.*

A *DEFENCE of the true ſence, &c.* The man hath well ſaid in promiſing a *defence of the true ſence* of any *Scripture.* Oh that there were a heart and underſtanding in him to performe it accordingly: I would ſtrive to outrun all MR. *Walkers Diſciples* in my reſpects, and honour to him. But they that made and *worſhipped the Golden Calfe*, honoured it and ſtyled it with the *Name* of a *God, Theſe are thy Gods, O Iſrael &c.* So is it not much to be wondered at, if MR. *Walker*, having made and taken unto himſelfe the figure of a falſe *interpretation*, doth the beſt he can to honour and grace it before the world, with the rich Style of *The true ſence and meaning &c.* There was never any man that went about to adulterate the Kings *Coyne*, and to put off *copper* for *Gold*, but carefully provided for that, that *Carolus Rex Dei gratia &c.* ſhould be ſtamped in as faire a *Character* upon it, as is to be found upon any piece comming out of the Kings *Mint.* *M.W.p.1.2.*

But the mans heart presently begins to fall under the greatnesse of his *enterprise*: in the very first clause of his *Discourse*, he abates much of his confidence in the title. For that which was there, *the true sence and meaning of the Apostle* (simply) is here only *The true sence* with limitation, *viz.* according to the *Common judgement of the most godly, learned, and judicious Divines, of the best Reformed Churches, &c.* Now wee know that sometimes there is (and oftner may bee then we are aware of) as great a difference betweene *the true sence and meaning of a Scripture*, and the judgement of the most godly, and *learned Divines*, as is betweene Heaven and Earth, yea the judgement of the most godly, learned, and *judicious Divines*, hath sometimes stood at that distance from *the true sence and meaning* of some *Scriptures*, that they have rejected the *Scriptures* themselves, upon a conceit that they contayned things in them contrary to their judgements, and apprehensions. This heavy censure, that notable and rare piece of *Divine inspiration*, the Booke of the *Revelation* suffered, even from the most godly, and *learned Divines* the Church of *God* had in it about the second or third *Century* after *Christ*, being generally disclaimed as *Apocryphall* and irreptitious. It were easie to cite instances in abundance of great variance, and dissention betweene the judgments of *Divines*, of *Master Walkers* qualification, *and the true sence and meaning of many Scriptures*: and yet hee that saith and knoweth all this, may reverence the uniforme judgements of such *Divines*, touching the *sence of Scriptures*, as much (or more) than *Master Walker* himselfe doth.

Well: but yet he bewrayeth some consciousnes, or timorousnes in his undertaking, though thus qualified and explained. He doth not loosely say, that *the sence* of these *Scriptures*, which he undertakes to defend, is the sence given *by most Godly Divines*, but with caution upon caution, thus: *according to the common judgement of the most godly, and of the best Reformed Churches.* Whether

ther by *the moſt godly, learned, and indicious Divines*, he meanes the greater part, or number of *Divines* that are godly, learned, *&c.* or whether onely thoſe that are moſt eminent amongſt and above their Fellowes, *for godlines, learning, &c.* he wiſely leaves unexplained: that in caſe the one ſence ſhould oppreſſe him, he might make the other his friend to releive him. If hee deſires to be underſtood in the former ſence (which is the more honeſt, obvious, and direct of the two) then I feare he will be as hardly put to it for *voyces* amongſt *Reformed Divines*, as the *Pope* was in the *Councell* of *Trent*, and muſt take ſome ſuch courſe to make *Authors*, as he did *Biſhops*. *As for Luther, Calvin, Muſculus, Bullinger &c.* They will not come over to him with his whiſtling: except (haply) he hath a ſecret pack of *Authors*, of the ſame Names, but of different judgements, with thoſe that are commonly knowne by their *Names*, in the World. And it ſhould ſeeme (indeed) he hath ſome ſuch unknowne advantage, for *page* 50. hee citeth wordes out of *Calvins Inſtitutions*, which in my exemplar are not to be found in the place cited. And *p* 41. he tels a tale out of St. *Bernard's* 190. *Epiſtle* concerning one *Peter Abilaird* (as his *Scribe* nameth him) which I beleeve is not to be found in that *Epiſtle*, except it be in his own Book. If the latter ſence ſhould be intended by him (which yeelds the beſt ſhadow for him to ſhelter himſelf under) it will be hard (I confeſſe) to evict him in this; becauſe it muſt then firſt be decided (which will never be but by a generall *Councell*, and yet *I* thinke as ſoone without it, as with it) which, or who in all that great retinue and *equipage* of *Reformed Divines*, have the preheminence above all their fellowes, in all thoſe three incomparable qualifications, *Godlineſſe, learning, Judgement*. For as *Seneca* ſaith well. *Non eſt admirationi una arbor, ubi totum Nemus in eandem altitudinem ſurrexit.* And except there be ſome one or more amongſt them, who is more excellent then all his Neighbours, in all the three rare en-

 dowments

dowments ſpecified (which is moſt unlikely: for excellencies commonly walke ſingle, and not by troupes, or companies, in the World) then hath *Maſter Walker* undertaken nothing at all, concerning the judgement of *Reformed Divines* according with him, in the *ſence* he gives of theſe *Scriptures*. But howſoever, hee himſelfe begins betimes to ſtumble at that *Stone*, (which afterwardes he chides me very ſharply for ſtumbling at, though it be onely in his apprehenſion, and I make queſtion whether even there alſo) *viz. Ambiguities in diſputation*: and I would be loath to trouble my ſelfe with taking him up every time, he falls on this hand, in his diſcourſe. Sure *I am* (whether it be my example, or his own, he followes ſo cloſe, I know not) that he ſpeakes little better then *ambiguouſly* in the greateſt part of this tract: except it be where either he ſpeakes manifeſt untruths, or good common ſence, inſtead of reaſon. As immediately after, when he ſpeakes of the *moſt Godly, Learned, and indicious Divines of the beſt Reformed Churches*, what *Heyſer* ſhould a man plough with to find out his *riddle* in thoſe wordes, *the beſt Reformed Churches*? who knowes in what order and Method the *Reformed Churches* are muſtered and ranged in Mr. *Wal.* Booke of valuations of *Churches*? *Quas quibus anteferas.* Suppoſe we may probably conceive that hee takes the *Reformed Church of England*, for one of the beſt of theſe *Churches*, may we not as well caſt lots, as conceive otherwiſe, to which of the other *Churches*, he will give the Honour of ſitting at the right hand of the *Engliſh*? whether to the *German, French*, or *Dutch Churches*, or ſome other?

Beſides, if hee ſhould particularly declare himſelfe, what and how many *Reformed Churches* he meanes, by the beſt: yet wee are little the neerer, knowing his mind concerning the *Divines*, whoſe judgements hee undertakes to aſſociate with his owne, in the ſence and meaning of theſe *Scriptures*. *The beſt Reformed Churches* have

have not necessarily the *most godly, learned, and judicious Divines* in them. The sweetest showers may sometimes fall upon the rocks: and *God* is at liberty to blesse weaker and lower instruments, above the increase of those, that are more excellent and glorious. Therefore all this while no man can comprehend by what he hath said, what *Divines* should bee of his judgement in the *interpretation* of these passages: neither have wee any such cause to complaine, that wee are kept in *suspense* herein, because (as the saying is) *nihil dat quod non habet*, that is, *nothing gives*, but what it haves: it is good manners for us to be served after himselfe. I beleeve he hath no great assurance himselfe of any in this kind. When his confidence this way comes to him, I doubt not but we shall have it good cheap.

But what is the *sence and meaning* of these places, for the *defence* whereof he hath taken such hold of *shield* and *buckler*? I confesse he layes downe discourse enough to open seven mens mindes at once, in as much as the *sence* and *meaning* of these *Scriptures* comes to. But (whether it be my dulnesse or ignorance in his *Rhetorick and Logick*, whereof I am taxed sharply enough, and it may be, deservedly enough too, *page* 28. and *page* 37. of his answer) I have no skill of his *Vlyssean Eloquence*, when he powreth out words νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότα χειμερίῃσι, as thick as flakes of *snow* in *Winter* time; they make me as blind, as the Snow it selfe doth, when I travell in it. I cannot find out his *Mole-hill* of meaning for his Mountains of words. If all that he delivers in that *multilineary Hyperbaton*, be that *sence* and *meaning* which hee hath taken into his protection, surely I neither was, nor am his adversary, in farre the greatest part of it. So that for the *true sence and meaning* of the place, as he hath promised the defence thereof, so (I confesse) in some sence, he hath well and sufficiently performed. As *Venus* protected and defended her son *Æneas*, when she put him into a cloud, where none could see him: so hath Mr.

 W. abundantly

W. abundantly provided for the *safety* and *defence* of the *true sence* of these *Scriptures*, that no man shall be able to finde it, or come at it to doe it any harme, by spreading such a thick and darke *cloud* of words round about it on every side, Surely he hath found the *line* and *Plummet* which the builders of *Babel* used *in laying the corner stone* of their Tower, and hath stretched it upon the foundation of this his *Fabrick*. Onely whereas (towards the end of this 2. *page*) he acknowledgeth and granteth, that upon *Abrahams beleefe* of the promise, *God counted this unto him for righteousnesse*; that is, accepted and accounted him for a *righteous* man: if he would not afterwards misuse his owne good wordes, with a bad meaning, for my part I should never say that black was his eye, in this Question. But this is frequently observed in men that are ingaged against the *truth*, that the truth sometimes will be too hard for them, and breake *Prison* before their keepers are aware of it. I passe by other things in this page, that well deserve *virgulam Censoriam*, my discourse will live and maintaine it selfe sufficiently, upon the tithes of Mr. *Ws.* errours, if they were but truely payd.

Mr. *W.* p. 2. The corrupt *exposition* of the words by the *Heretick Socinus*, the *Arminians &c.* Surely my Adversary hath heard of the most inhumane and unnaturall cruelty of the Tyrant *Mezentius*: and hath taken his practise in one piece of unmercifulnesse towards me from him, whose practise was this (as *Virgil* relateth it,)

Mortua Corporibus jungebat Corpora vivis,
componens *Corponerit manibusque manus, atq; oribus ora:*

He us'd to joyne and couple living and dead men together, with face to face, hands to hands, *&c.* and so to keepe them, or drag them about together, till the living found an end of his misery, by joyning hands with

with his Companion in death. So Mr. *W.* intent in his necromanticall bringing up the dead Corpes of *Socinus*, and *Arminius* ſo often upon his *Stage*, is to bind mee hard, firſt to the one, and then to the other: and in this poſture to drag me up and downe at his pleaſure, that ſo by this unnaturall, and artificiall torment and ſhame, *I might goe downe with ſorrow into my grave.* But the beſt is, he can find onely greene withs to bind mee withall, which will ſnap in ſunder like a threed of tow, when it toucheth the fire: I have a ſharpe knife about mee, called truth, that will preſently deliver me out of theſe bands *by cutting in ſunder thoſe cords of vanity, wherwith my enemy hath bound me.* And if I tooke any pleaſure in troubling my ſelfe that way, wherein my adverſary (it ſeemes) takes ſingular delight and contentment; I could ſtretch his opinions in this *controverſie*, upon *Socinian* and *Arminian* tenter-hookes, better cheap, and with leſſe ſtreyning by farre, then hee either doth or can doe mine. Yea I ſhall anon preſent you *Arminius* himſelfe, with his mouth as full of Mr. *W.* opinion in the point of *Imputation*, as it can hold, without ſpilling. Yea (that which is yet more) if I ſought any ſuch bloudy revenge upon the man, I make no Queſtion, but I could with the full leave and conſent of his opinion, make him hold up his hand at the barre, and anſwer for thoſe crimes of *hereſie* and *blaſphemy*, where & for which he hath ſo oft arraigned me, with the higheſt and cleereſt reluctancy of my opinions. But if Mr. *W.* will be content to be the *erratique*, I ſhall be content to abate him the *Heretique*, in the bargaine, though I might very lawfully demand it.

But firſt let me aske Mr. *W.* (for I confeſſe I am to ſeeke and altogether ignorant in this poynt, if all that hee ſeemes to imply, be Goſpell) what if it ſhould bee granted, that both *Arminius* and *Socinus*, were of the ſame judgement with me, in the interpreration of the *Scriptures* in Queſtion? Is it either *hereſie* or *blaſphe-*

my

my, yea or a ſimple errour, to profeſſe or hold any thing that *Heretiques* or *blaſphemers* have profeſſed before? Then certainely it is both *Arch-hereſie* and *blaſphemy* to hold that *Ieſus Chriſt* is the Sonne of *God*, becauſe the *Arch-blaſphemer* the *Divell* once profeſſed it, and yet (it is like) beleeveth it, *Mar.* 1. 24. And if Mr. *W.* were but ſet upon this horſe back himſelfe, and made to ride as far as he would carry him, he would be the monſter of all *Hereticks* before he return'd back again. He would be *Socinian*, *Arminian*, *Servetian*, *Swenkfeldian*, *Oſiandrian*, *Antitrinitarian*, *Arrian*, *Eutychian*, *Neſtorian*, *Valeminian*, *Novatian*, *Pelagian*, *Donatiſt*, *Manichee*, and what not? Becauſe it is certaine that he holds ſome opinion in Religion, which all and every one of theſe held, as the *unity of the Godhead*, and many others. But it may be Mr. *W.* knowes how to diſtinguiſh here, as acutely betweene himſelfe and his adverſary, as ſome of our Seraphicall *Doctors* of *Rome* doe, when they tell us that the *Scriptures*, as they are alledged and cited by them, are the word of *God*: but as they are cited by us, they are the word of the *Divel*: ſo that the rule or ground of reaſon, which applyed to Mr. *G.* will make him a *Heretick* and *blaſphemer*, being applyed to Mr. *W.* upon the ſame termes, is preſently charmed, and looſeth all its vertue and operation, and leaves him as *Orthodox*, as Saint *Iohn* himſelfe.

Secondly, let me ſay this likewiſe, that it is but a knack of *Popiſh Mountebankerie*, to ſeeke to oppreſſe an opinion that any way croſſeth them, and to derive envie and reproach upon the head of it, by putting it into evill company, and numbring it amongſt the *tenets* and *opinions* of ſuch men, as are otherwiſe obnoxious, and branded with the ſhame and infamy of ſome broad errour. Thus *Prateolus* (a *Popiſh Author*) makes account he ſtrikes a great ſtroke againſt thoſe, that hold it lawfull to eat any meates upon any day without making a difference, by finding this opinion held by *Jovini-*

an

an an *Heretique*. So the ſame *Author* thinkes he doth the *Romiſh* cauſe *Knights* ſervice againſt that opinion, which teacheth *iuſtification* by *faith* alone, by ſaying that this *opinion* was taught by *Simon Magus*. So to adminiſter the *Sacrament* in both kinds, hee proves to be damnable, becauſe *Neſtorius* the *Heretique* did ſo. So againe he makes it one of the *hereſies* of the *Armeni*, that they denyed *Purgatory*. This is a knowne trick of *legerdemaine* amongſt them. Whatſoever my Adverſary is in his opinion againſt me, *Proteſtant, or Popiſh*: certaine I am, that hee is purely, putely, and putidly *Popiſh* in the *method* of his proceedings againſt mee: and goes about to make the world beleeve, that my opinion muſt needs be an errour, yea and more then an errour, a damnable *hereſie*, becauſe forſooth (if men be ſo wiſe as to beleeve him) he brings newes from a far, and tells a tale, that he hath ſeene it amongſt *Socinian*, and *Arminian Hereſies*. A man that had look'd into the *Lyons denne*, whilſt *Daniel* was there, might by as ſtrong an *Argument*, have proved the *Prophet* to have beene a *Beaſt*: Mr. *Wa.* himſelfe, if this tackling will hold, may prove *Solomons Lilie, Cant. 1. 2. to be a thorne*. Yea by the out-ſtretched arme of this *Logick*, the *Iewes* may juſtifie their crucifying of the *Lord Chriſt, becauſe hee was numbred amongſt the tranſgreſſours, and two Malefactours crucified with him*: which rare peice of profound *policy*, Mr. *Wal.* (it ſeemes) hath coppied out in his anſwere, in *crucifying* the *truth* betweene thoſe two Malefactors, *Socinus* and *Arminius*. If Mr. *W.* had firſt proved the opinion maintained by mee to be erroneous, (but that is a worſe Crow to pull, then any hee hath pluckt yet) and then have juſtly charged thoſe ſore aggravations of *Arminianiſme* and *Socinianiſme* upon it, it had been ſomewhat reaſonable and methodicall: but to ſcourge it uncondemned (at leaſt upon any lawfull triall and conviction) with the *Scorpions* of thoſe odious *imputations*, ſhewes rather the canker in his pen, then

love either of *truth*, or men in his affections.

But thirdly, (and laſtly) if either man or woman, be troubled in mind, upon this point, whether Mr. *W.* makes conſcience or no, of what hee writeth, let him but diligently weigh and compare a few *pages* following, with the greateſt part of his diſcourſe, (wherein he ſpeaks ſo much of *Arminius* and *Socinus*, and he ſhall receive ſatisfaction to his hearts deſire. *Arminius in reſp. ad 4. Artic. impoſitum*, ſaith, *juſtitiam Chriſti nobis imputari, & fieri noſtram gratioſâ æſtimatione Dei, & arbitrari ſe, id ipſum contineri verbis Apoſtoli, 2 Cor. 5. Chriſtum fecit Deus pro nobis peccatum, ut nos eſſemus juſtitia Dei in illo*, that is, that the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* is *imputed* to us, and is made ours by the gracious eſteeme or account of *God*, and this hee conceives to be conteyned, in thoſe words of the *Apoſtle*, 2 *Cor.* 5. *God made Chriſt ſinne for us, that we might be made the righteouſnes of God in him.*

Fortis ubi eſt Ajax? ubi ſunt ingentia magni
—Verba viri?

Where is brave *Ajax?* where the bluſtering brags of the ſterne Champion? what Mr. *Walker, tute Lepus es, & pulpamentum quæris?* Are you a Hare your ſelfe, and call for hare to eat? Is Mr. *Walker* himſelfe an *Arminian*, and will crie out of *Arminianiſme*.

Quis tulerit Gracchos de ſeditione querentes?
Who can indure to heare without diſdaine,
The *Gracchi* of ſedition to complaine?

Or if he will diſclaime *Arminius* judgement in the Teſtimony cited, touching the *Imputation* of *Chriſts righteouſnes*, let him diſclaime his own alſo. For ſure no two judgements ever jump'd better together, then the judgement of *Arminius* the *Heretique*, and of Mr. *W.* the *Orthodox* in the point of *Imputation*. Therefore there is

a neceſſity lying upon him, either to take me into Communion, and fellowſhip with himſelfe in his opinion about *imputation*, or elſe to deliver me from the *imputation* of *Arminianiſme*, in what I hold.

I deny not, but *Arminius* himſelfe (and ſome of his followers much more) expreſſe themſelves (ſometimes) on the other hand, and doe affirme, the *imputation* of *Faith* for righteouſnes, and not the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, (in this uncertainty of expreſſing themſelves,) reſembling both Mr. *W.* himſelfe, yea and men of farre greater note in the Church of *Chriſt*, whoſe names for the honour due unto them, upon this occaſion I forbeare. But yet Mr. *W.* undertaking the office of an *Interpreter* of their mindes, and meanings this way, (though otherwiſe, I eaſily beleeve, no great friend of theirs) to make his charge againſt me, and my opinion the more heavy, and ſore (as he hopes) hath in many things much eaſed and lightned their burdens, in the erroneous groſſenes of their *opinion*, by his *Interpretation*. Before I demonſtrate this, I would firſt know, by what prerogative *Law*, Mr. *VV.* ſhould bee exempted or excuſed from being an *Arminian*, holding and maintaining directly, what *Arminius* himſelfe in one place affirmeth: but I at no hand muſt be excuſed, holding what the ſame perſon affirmeth in another. I know not who hath given Mr. *VV.* any power to umpire betweene himſelfe and me upon termes of ſuch inequality. And further I deſire to be Mr. *Ws.* Remembrancer of another thing by the way: That thoſe are called falſe witneſſes by the Holy *Ghoſt*, that gave Teſtimony againſt *Chriſt*, though they teſtifie little (in words) againſt him, but what himſelfe indeed ſpake (*Mat.* 26. 60. 61) Their drawing and wreſting his wordes beſides his meaning, was enough to brand them, with that black brand. So though Mr. *W.* could (haply) pick out here and there, ſome *phraſes* or *expreſſions* out of *Arminius* and his followers: that may in the letter and ſound of wordes,

come neere ſome expreſſions uſed by mee, in ſetting downe my opinion: yet if upon this, hee will ſtand up, and beare *witneſſe* againſt me, or my *opinion*, that we are *Arminian*: this will not ſave him harmeleſſe, againſt the juſt *imputation* of falſe *witneſſe-bearing*. And as *Anti-Arminian* as himſelfe is, or deſires to appeare, it were an eaſie matter to reconcile him, if *Similitude* or *Sympathie* in ſpeaking, now and then, would doe it. The ſaying of *Bellarmine* in this caſe, is ſound and good: *Non in verbis, ſed in ſenſu, fides eſt, nec idem Symbolum habemus ſi in explicatione diſſidemus.* The greateſt *Hereticks* of old, agreed with the *Orthodox* Fathers, in receiving the ſame *Creed*: yet were they of a farre different *Faith*, and judgement from them, in thoſe Articles of *Religion* contained in the *Creed*. Now concerning my *Antagoniſt*, the truth is, that as he hath baniſhed my minde and meaning out of my wordes (in many places) and put his own ſowre, and diſtorted apprehenſions in their ſtead, and would faine make me *father* the baſtard-brood of his diſtempered imagination: So on the other hand, in laying downe the *Arminian opinion* touching thoſe *Scripture* paſſages in Queſtion, and the point of *imputation*, though he ſubſtitutes alſo, and rather gives them an opinion, then relates any from them, yet hee playes the part of a good fairy with them, and leaves them a changeling better favour'd then their owne child. But hee had no other way or method to bring both ends of his project together, to make the *Arminian tenet* and mine meet, but onely by taking their crooked opinion in his right hand, and my ſtraight opinion in his left; and ſo bow the one, and unbow the other, till they ſhould run *parallell* together.

To make good (in few wordes) what I ſay, concerning his favourable (but falſe) *interpretation* of the *Arminian notion* (in the things in queſtion,) I deſire that theſe two clauſes following, wherein he repreſents (as he pretends) the opinion of *Arminians*, touching the

imputation

imputation of *faith*, may be diligently compared, with the *interpretations* and explications made of the ſame opinion, by other *learned, godly, judicious and Orthodox Divines*, that doubtles have as deepe an inſight into thoſe *myſteries*, and know what Spirit of errour it is that ruleth in the Kingdome of *Remonſtrancy*, as well as Mr. *Wal.* doth: And more particularly, to thoſe that deſire fully to know, with how little *dexterity* or *integrity*, Mr *VV.* hath here deciphered the *Arminian Doctrine* (touching matters in Queſtion) I deſire to recommend the diligent peruſall, of the tenth *Chapter*, of a Booke ſet forth by the foure famous Profeſſours of *Divinity*, (who lived amongſt the ableſt men of judgement, that and where *Arminianiſme* had it's Throne: and in this reſpect, were more likely to know their depths, then other men that are more ſtrangers to them, about the year 162<, entitled, *Cenſura in confeſſionem ſeu declarationem ſententiæ eorum, qui in fœderato Belgio Remonſtrantes vocantur &c.*

The two paſſages in Mr *VV.* are theſe. Firſt, that *faith* and *beleeving*, is the onely thing which *God* of his *grace* is pleaſed to ordaine, for all the *righteouſnes*, which a man ſhall have for his *juſtification &c.* Secondly, by *Faith* and *beleeving* they underſtand no more but a confidence in *God*, that he will performe his *promiſes* made in *Chriſt*, and an aſſent unto his *word*, that it is true. Now he that ſhall compare theſe *expreſſions* (with others more in Mr *VVs.* wooddy explication) which pretend to ſhew what the *Arminians* meane by their *faith*, which they ſay is *imputed* for *righteouſnes*, with ſeverall expreſſions of their owne, cited by the forenamed *Divines*, and charged home with foulneſſe and dangerouſnes of errour, will find them to agree like *Harp* and *harrow*. It fully appeares from ſeverall paſſages there, that by that *Faith*, which the *Arminians* ſo generally affirme to bee *imputed* for *righteouſnes*, they meane not a bare aſſent to the word of *God*, that it is true (which is Mr. *VVs.* κακοχαρακτηρ, but an univerſall *obedience* to the

will of *God*, in all those duties, which hee requires of men in the *Gospell*. In the beginning of that *Chapter*, they are challenged by these worthy *Divines*, for affirming the *word*, *Faith*, to be sometimes taken (in *Scripture*) *prototâ & universâ illâ Dei voluntate* that is, for the whole universall will of *God*, which before they had said, *God* would have performed by us. In which sence, they would be taken and understood in this *Chapter*. Afterwards they are charged againe, with *Pontifician* friendship, *in eo, quòd opera inter justificationis causas numerant, aequali cum fide jure*, that is, that they place *workes* amongst the causes of *justification*, and that with as much right, as *Faith* it selfe. Againe (a little after) they are charged to have drawne this their *notion* of *faith* in *justification*, out of the *Socinian* Lakes, which yeeld such waters as these: *Meminisse debemus, fidem hanc, Scilicet quâ justificamur, Dei obedientiam esse*. That is, we must remember, that that *Faith* whereby wee are *justified*, is the obeying of *God*. And presently after: *In Christum credere nihil aliud est, quàm Deo ad ipsius Christi normam & praescriptum obedientem se prabere*. That is, To beleeve in *Christ* is nothing else, but for a man to yeild up himselfe in *obedience* to *God* according to the rule and prescript of *Christ*. To passe by many other passages in this *chapter*, to the same effect: The *Arminian Doctrine* is further charged, by that *faith*, which it holds to be *imputed* for *righteousnes*, to understand and meane, *fidem ipsam in se, qua apud Deum habeatur pro justitiâ, quatenus fidei nomine comprehenditur pœnitentia, resipiscentia, & in universum obedientia hominis Christiani*. So that either Mr. *Walker*, or these men are foully out, in drawing the lineaments of the *Arminian faith* in this point of *imputation*. If Mr. *W.* will chuse rather to lay the burden upon their shoulder, I suppose it will not much pinch them, because I doe not thinke there is any man else will doe it but himselfe. I acknowledge there are some expressions, used by these great and learned men

men in this tract of their diſcourſe, wherein I deſire *Chriſtian* leave to diſſent from them: but as well for their ability as integrity, in repreſenting the *true, genuine*, and *native* ſhape both of the *Arminian* and *Socinian Doctrine* in theſe points, I thinke their Authority is unparellable. Conſonant unto theſe things, ſet downe by them, touching the way of *Remonſtrancy* in the point under queſtion, are thoſe briefe paſſages that are found in *Doctor Prideaux* (a great light of the *Church*, yet living and ſhining) *Lect. 5. de Iuſtificatione.* Having mentioned *Vorſtius* opinion, who held *faith* to bee *imputed, immediatè & formaliter; meritum Chriſti, mediatè & effectivè*, he addes as followeth: *ubi per fidem ulteriùs oſtendit, ſe obſervationem Chriſtianiſmi ſolummodò intelligere, quia credere idem eſt, quod obſervare Chriſti præcepta*, that is, by *faith*, he further ſheweth, that he onely meaneth the obſervation of *Chriſtianity*, becauſe to *beleeve*, and to obſerve the Commandements of *Chriſt*, are the ſame. *Nec diſputavit tandem concludere &c.* that is. And was not aſham'd at the laſt to conclude, that *iuſtifying faith* is that ſame inherent *righteouſnes*, which the *Papiſts* urge. a little before, mentioning the opinion of *Arminius* himſelfe, touching *faith* in the matter of *iuſtification* (as *Corvinus* a great Diſciple of his undertakes to interpret his Maſter) *Arminio* (ſaith he) *minimè placuit quod fides dicitur inſtrumentalis iuſtificationis noſtræ cauſa*, that is, *Arminius* would by no means have *faith* termed the inſtrumentall cauſe of *iuſtification*: which is as directly contrary to what I have openly profeſſed, and maintained ſince my firſt dealing in this *controverſie*, as it is to what Mr. *VV.* affirmeth, concerning the *Arminians* themſelves, *p.* 4. Where he affirmeth, that they ſay that *faith* is *imputed* for *righteouſnes*, as an inſtrument, which abundantly confirmes that which I ſaid before, that Maſter *VV.* hath highly befriended the *Arminian* party in laying downe their *opinion*, onely to doe me and my opinion the greater diſ-

pleaſure

pleaſure and deſpite. The laſt named *Doctor* in the ſame *Lecture*, cites one thing more out of *Bertius*, (another Prince of the *Arminian* band) in an *Epiſtle* written by him to *Lubbertus*: *viz.* that here hee acknowledgeth, *hanc ſententiam meritum Chriſti excludere*, that is, that the *opinion* of *Vorſtius* touching the *imputation* of his *Faith* (which is the ſame with the common *opinion* of the Remonſtrants, as was before intimated) doth exclude the merit of *Chriſt*, (*viz.* from *juſtification*) which againe is not more contrary, to what Mr. *W.* grants concerning the *Arminians*, *viz.* that they acknowledge *Chriſts* perfect *ſatisfaction* and *righteouſnes*, to be the meritorious cauſe of our *juſtification*, p. 4. then to what I have both publiquely taught ever ſince my firſt ſtepping into theſe waters of *ſtrife*, (as ſome have made them) ſtill ready to profeſſe and maintaine (upon occaſion) every houre. I wiſh that Maſter *W.* and his *opinion*, maintaining the *imputation* of the active *obedience* of *Chriſt* (in the letter and formality of it) for *righteouſnes*, did no more endanger or trench upon the merit of *Chriſts ſatisfaction*, then either I or mine *opinion* do. I doe not charge any guiltineſſe that way upon the man: I verily conceive of him, that it is farre from his intentions, either to deny or to deſtroy, or in the leaſt meaſure to wrong or prejudice the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*: but for that opinion of his concerning *imputation*, it hath beene arreſted and arraigned elſewhere, and was found full, if not of perfect guilt, yet of much jealouſie and ſuſpicion that way. There are ſeverall other things in this tract of his diſcourſe, concerning the corrupt expoſition of *Socinus*, *Arminius* &c. as one or two contradictions, with ſome ſuch pettie overſights, and diverſe things affirmed looſely and at peradventure, without the leaſt proofe or ſemblance of *truth*, which if matters of exception and advantage, were any thing *rare* and hard to come by, might be improved to good purpoſe that way. But I reſt contented with this one-

ly

ly, to make it knowne to the *World*, that Maſter *Ws. Arminianiſme*, and *Arminianiſme* indeed, are in many things (and thoſe of maineſt importance in the queſtion depending) as contrary the one to the other, as the *Eaſt* is to the *Weſt*: and that the opinion maintained by me, in the notes I left with him, hath as little of *Arminian* blood running in the veynes of it, as the *opinion* that himſelfe maintaineth, yea and farre leſſe too, if matters were throughly ſifted and examined betweene us. The *Arminian Faith*, which they ſet up for *imputation* unto *righteouſnes*, includes *obedience* to the Law of *God* Mr *Walkers Faith*, ſet up by him for the ſame purpoſe, includes obedience to the ſame *Law*: their *faith* an *obedience* performed in their owne perſon: Mr. *Ws. Faith* or *obedience*, as if it had beene performed in their owne perſons. The *Arminian faith* excludes (as we have heard) the merit of *Chriſts ſatisfaction* from *iuſtification*: and Mr. *Ws. faith* if it were well examined, doth little leſſe. For he that hath a perfect legall *righteouſnes imputed* unto him upon as good termes, as if he had performed it in his owne perſon, what need hath he of any *ſatisfaction*, or attonement by blood, to bee made for him? But I have impleaded this opinion, more at large elſe where, and have wrung the beſt weapons out of the hand of the adverſary, wherein he moſt puts his truſt. I ſhall therefore here reſt from this labour. And for Mr. *Ws. Arminianiſme*, how oft ſoever he ſhall afterwards bee troubleſome to mee, therewith in his *diſcourſe*, I ſhall neither be troubleſome to my ſelfe, nor to my *Reader* with it any more; but let it goe for naught, when it comes in my way. Onely this I will ſay for it, before I here give it over, that ſo wee may yet have a friendly parting: that if ever I be weary of the *truth* and deſire to turne *Arminian*, I will be an *Arminian* of of Mr. *Ws.* calculation: his *Arminian*, is incomparably better, and more harmleſſe in his *dogmaticalls*, then any other mans *Arminian* that I can meet with. And

notwithstanding his *Charity* hath abounded towards the *Arminian* party (as you have heard) yet towards the *Socinian*, it abounds much more. Other *Divines* and Writers generally, represent *Socinianisme* upon the *Stage*, as an accursed *Denier* of *Christs satisfaction*. *Socinian* (saith Doctor *Prideaux* in his fifth *Lecture de justificatione*) *impudentius negant, Christum pro peccatis nostris satisfeciſſe: & ubivis asserunt &c.* that is: The *Socinians* more impudently deny, that *Christ* made any *satisfaction for our sinnes*, and still affirme, that *God* the *Father hath received us into grace or favour, by a free condonation or remission of sinnes*, for *Christ*. But Mr. *W.* making them to draw in the same yoke with his *Arminians*, wipes off this foule aspersion from them, and claps on a *beutie's* spot (in comparison) upon their face, in stead of it: speaking of them both together thus: when they acknowledge that *Christ* his perfect *satisfaction* and *righteousnes*, is the meritorious cause of our *justification &c.* So that it seemes Mr. *W.* hath wrought a great and miraculous cure upon the *Socinian heresie*, and hath brought it back ten degrees (at least) by which it was gone downe towards *Hell:* It now acknowledgeth *Christs* perfect *satisfaction*, as the meritorious cause of our *justification*: onely it halts upon a lame interpretation, of what it holds consonant to the *truth*. But Mr. *W.* (I conceive) was more provident and subtile then angrie men usually are, in displaying the *Socinian heresie* by the figure *Synechdoche*, onely mentioning a part (and that a very small one too) for the whole: for by this meanes he gaines more liberty and freedome, to draw me and my *opinion* into the reproach, and scandall thereof. For otherwise had hee but mentioned that which is the head and height of *Socinian blasphemy, viz.* the denying the merit and *satisfaction* of *Christ*, now it would not have so much as coloured with the *opinion* maintained by me, which riseth up with a high hand to plead the merit of that *satisfaction*. But

Master

Mr. *W.* having onely a deſire and intent to caſt dirt in the face of the *truth*, and him that maintaines it, was loath to looſe the opportunity of ſuch a kennell. Otherwiſe as *Martial* deſcanted upon the *Painter*, that had drawne a picture of *Venus* ſomewhat courſely, and untowardly, ſaying of him, that ſurely he meant to flatter *Minerva*,

Qui Venerem tuam pinxit, Lycori,
Blandiτus (puto) Pictor eſt Minervæ:

So on the contrary, a man might thinke, that Mr. *W.* intent in drawing the portraitures of the *Arminian* and *Socinian hereſies*, with ſo much favour, was onely to oppreſſe the ancient *hereſies*, of *Arrius* and the reſt, with new envie and indignation.

Well: Maſter *W.* having ſo fouly and *Ignoramus*-like miſcarried in acquainting us with the ſtate of the *Arminian* and *Socinian hereſie* in the expoſition of his *Scriptures*, and having painted the *Crow* and *Raven*, more like a *Dove*, and a *Partridge* then otherwiſe: I appeale to Maſter *W.* owne conſcience, (if there be any motion or life yet left in it) whether here be not a fitter and more juſt occaſion, then any hee hath met with in my writing (if a man had a mind to it) to cry out, lyar, lying *Sophiſter*, ignorant, impudent, *&c.* And yet I confeſſe againe, that though I had a mind to doe it, it were no wiſedome (but impudent fooliſhnes indeed) to write the deſtruction of *Troy* after *Homer*. But if Mr. *W.* bee no better, at giving us out the mind of the Holy *Ghoſt* in the *Scriptures*, then hee hath ſhewed himſelfe an *Interpreter* of the *myſteries* of the *Arminian*, and *Socinian hereſie*, (and it is much to be feared the whole piece is of the ſame ſpinning) inſtead of the *true* and *Orthodox expoſition* of the *Apoſtles* meaning, you ſhall have the *Heterodox* and miſhapen conceipt of his owne brain, ſet up upon the *Stage* before you. I will ſpend no

more time about Master *VVs. Socinianisme*, neither (though it be the best that ever man met with, or can hope to meet with in any Author under *Heaven*) except, it be to say this: though he professeth the deepest *enmity* and even a hellish detestation of that way, yet is he the greatest *Tempter* and allurer of men into this way, of any I know, one or other, at this day living amongst us, by his too too *ingennous* and *gracious qualification* of their *blasphemous* errours.

Mr. *VV.p.* 5, 6, 7, &c. The true *exposition* defended, here my *Antagonist*, being conscious (it seemes) that hee had not played the man, in laying downe the *sence* and *meaning* of the *Scriptures* in question, before (*page* 1. and 2.) sufficiently, hopes to come into his credit (in due time) by bestowing words enough upon the businesse, if his *Reader* will be content to take that for payment. If hee will not, I know not how he will much mend himself by this long word-*discourse* of severall pages together. I professe ingenuously, I never met with more loose, indigested, and *male-coherent* stuffe from the pen of a *Scholar*, within such a compasse, all my dayes. I dare not say that Mr. *W.* himselfe wants either *Logique* or *Rhetorique*: but this I may boldly say, that many things that come from him, are like to starve through extreme want of both: There is scarce ever a page but enterfires with other: Neither is there any thing said to purpose in one place, but is unsaid in another: his *notions* and sayings, being like unto *Cadmus* his souldiers that sprang up of the *Dragons* teeth.

word-discourse

Marte cadunt proprio per mutua vulnera fratres. i.
Brother his Brother Wounds to death each other.

So that Mr. *W.* needs not send to me to answere this piece of his: he hath performed the service himselfe to himselfe, and plainly sheweth, that hee objecteth nothing against me, but what hee knoweth himself how to answere. And if he will seale too, and ratifie what with

open

open mouth he affirmeth, in this *limb* of his *diſcourſe*, he will *ipſo facto* cancell and deface the whole body beſides. For doth he not (after an *importune* and *impertinent diſcourſe*, concerning the *difference* betweene that *Faith*, which he calls a naturall *habit*, or *power*, and that which he defines a *ſupernaturall* guift &c.) come to grant (*page* 7.) that *Abraham* reſting upon the *Lord* by firme *Faith*, for the performance of the *promiſes* made to him, the *Lord counted it to him for righteouſnes*, and preſently after (ſomewhat more *emphatically*, and with better agreement to the *truth*, then to his owne *opinion*) *even Faith was reckoned to him for righteouſnes*. And more plainely afterward *page* 11. where he pretends to center the large circumference of his former *diſcourſe* thus: „ *By faith and beleeving, which is counted to every true* „ *beleever, (and was counted to Abraham) for righteouſ-* „ *nes I underſtand here (according to the iudgement of the* „ *moſt Orthodox Diuines) the true, holy, ſpirituall Faith* „ *and beleef, which is before ſhewed to have beene in Abra-* „ *ham, and which is proper to the elect and regenerate &c.* Now whether ſuch a *faith* as this, being as himſelfe acknowledgeth, that very *faith*, which he had ſo operouſly and carefully diſtinguiſhed, defined, explaned, *page* 7. 8. be a *tropicall* or *Metonymicall faith*, or *Faith* in the proper nature, and direct ſignification, I leave to thoſe that want that, wherewith Maſter *W.* ſo aboundeth, to iudge and to conſider. Therefore if he meanes as hee ſaith in this place, that *faith in the proper ſence*, and not in the *figurative* (in which *ſence*, according to his acute interpretation, it ſignifieth the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, apprehended by it) be that which is *imputed* unto a *beleever* for *righteouſnes*, what have we to doe with all the *diſcourſe* following?

Aut fugiat Vticam, aut uſtus mittatur Ilerdam.
Downe let it ſwimme the ſtreame to *Vtica*,
Or to *Ilerda* pointed let it paſſe.

Let him disband those troopes of *slanders*, *reproches*, *calumnies*, *falsifications*, which hee hath mustered up against mee in the sequell of his *Tract*, for holding and maintaining the same *interpretation* of the word *faith*, which himself here avoucheth. And further that by *faith* in these *Scriptures*, which is oft said to bee *imputed* for *righteousnes*, Master *W.* cannot understand a *tropicall* or *Metonymicall Faith*, *viz.* the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, is as evident, as the foulest *non-sence* is from the fairest *truth*: because immediately after *page* 11, *interpreting* the word *righteousnes*, he saith by it is meant the *righteousnes* of *Christ &c.* So that if by *faith* we shall understand, the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, and by *righteousnes*, *the righteousnes* of *Christ* too, we must make the *Apostles* meaning, in plaine *language* to run thus: the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, is *imputed* to a *beleever*, for the *righteousnes* of *Christ*: which is such a *Hyperabsurdity*, that in Honour to Mr. *Ws. intellectualls* and *learning*, I cannot fasten upon him. Therefore whatsoever he talks afterward in his *discourse*, of a *tropicall* and *metonymicall* acception of *Faith* in these *Scriptures*, I will not *beleeve* but that he is in jest there, and in earnest here. I doe not thinke so meanely of him, that he will cast away his *gold*, to fill his hand with chaff in stead of it.

But the *truth* is, that in all he hath done (*in folio*) about the *explication* of this *Scripture*, hee hath onely prospered, in his *interpretation* of the word, *Faith*, or *beleeving*: which prosperity notwithstanding stayeth him, in all (almost) that followeth: and is it not pitty that faire weather should doe harme? In his *exposition* of the two other words, *imputing* and *righteousnesse* he boggles and flunders fouly.

First, for the *phrase* of *imputing* a thing to one, hee makes a *supposition*, that to *impute* and *accompt*, or *count*, are universally *termini aequipollentes*, wordes alwayes of one and the same signification. Against which misprision his owne instances, from the *Scriptures*, might have

misprision

have releived him. For 1 *King.* 1. 21. Where *Bathsheba* ſaith to *David*, *I and my Sonne Solomon ſhall be counted offendors*, it had hardly beene good *Engliſh* to have ſaid, *I and my Sonne Solomon ſhall be imputed offendors.* So *Nehe.* 13. 13. where it is ſaid of the *Levites*, that they were *counted faithfull*, it would have come off ſomewhat rugged, to have ſaid, that they were *imputed faithfull.* In ſome caſes, and falls of ſpeech, I confeſſe they may be of indifferent uſe, and ſignification, and particularly in the *Scriptures* in hand: to ſay that *Abrahams Faith*, either was *counted*, or *imputed* to him for *righteouſnes*, are both expreſſions of good propriety; and not much *difference* betweene them (except a man hath a mind to cavill and wrangle.) And wherein Maſter *W.* hath ſtrengthned his cauſe, by making theſe two terms, *imputing and counting*, to run alwayes hand in hand, I doe not yet apprehend: except it bee by gaining an opportunity of laying on more tongue, and multiplying *diſcourſe*: which how it availeth him in this buſineſſe, hath bin already intimated.

But the man is no where liker himſelfe (as touching the whole cariage of this buſineſſe) then in the deſcription he layes downe, of the *ſence* or *ſignification* of the *phraſe*, *imputing* a thing to one, *page* 9. His deſcripti-
„ on is this: the *phraſe* of *imputing* or *counting* a thing
„ to one, ſignifieth both in the Old and New *Teſtament*,
„ an act of *judgement* and eſtimation, by which a thing
„ is judged, eſteemed, reckoned, and accounted,
„ to bee as it is indeed. *Capiat, qui potis eſt capere.* Let him underſtand it, that hath where withall. I confeſſe Maſter *Ws. eloquence* paſſeth my *intelligence.* But

Firſt, I ſhould have thought (had I not beene here informed otherwiſe, and may yet for ought I know, ſtrayne curteſie with my information) that *God* his *imputing faith* for *righteouſnes* (take *faith* in what *ſence* you will) had bin an act of *grace* or *mercy* in *God*, and not an act of *judgement.*

Secondly

Secondly, every act of judging or esteeming a thing, to be as indeed it is, is not an *imputing* or *counting* it to another: which yet must bee, if Master *W.* hath rightly defined or described the *signification* and *importance* of the *phrase* of *imputing*: because the old standing *Law* of a true definition is, that it must be convertible with that which is *defined*. But that every *judging* or *esteeming* a thing, to be as indeed it is, is no *imputing* it to another, is evident: because when I judge the Sun to be greater then the Moone, I judge it as indeed it is: yet doe I not *impute* the Sunne to any man. So when I judge and esteeme Master *Ws.* quarrell against mee, to be groundlesse and causelesse, I *judge* and *esteeme* the thing, as indeed it is: yet doe I not hereby *impute* it to any man.

Thirdly, when *God imputes* either my *Faith* unto me, or *Christs righteousnes* unto me (the one being the *Scripture phrase*, the other Mr. *Walkers*,) for my *righteousnes* he doth not *judge*, or *esteeme* any thing to bee as indeed it is: for neither is my *faith*, nor the *righteousnes* of *Christ* indeed my *righteousnes*. But my *faith* in *Christ*, is that *Grace* which *God* hath consecrated, and ordained to bring me into *Communion* and *fellowship* of that *righteousnes*, that is, of that *justification* and *redemption* which *Christ* by the merit of his *life* and *death* hath purchased for me, and for all those that *beleeve* in him. Therefore the *phrase* of *imputing* doth not signifie, an act of *judgement* or estimation, by which a man *judgeth* or esteemeth a thing to be as indeed it is.

Fourthly, neither doe any of the instances from *Scripture*, either of the *Old* or *New Testament*, which himselfe produceth, any thing willingly, or naturally comply with this his description, of the signification of the *word, imputing*, as will appeare to any man, that shall but considerately and unpartially umpire betweene them.

Fifthly, (and lastly) there are some of these instances, that

that doe manifeſtly contradict that deſcription of his, and that according to his owne interpretation, of the *phraſe imputing*, when he comes to cite them. As that 2. *Sam.* 19. 19. where *Shimei* ſaith, *Let not my Lord impute iniquity unto mee.* He doth not (ſaith Mr. *W.* and that very truely, but contradictingly to himſelfe) deſire that *David* would not thinke, nor judge, nor *count* his *iniquitie* to be no *iniquitie*: this had beene againſt all reaſon. Therefore (ſay I) it is againſt all reaſon too, that Mr. *W.* ſhould ſay that the *phraſe* of *imputing* both in the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, ſtill ſignifies an act of *judgement* and eſtimation, by which a thing is judged and eſteemed, to bee as it is indeed. *Shimei's* act in curſing *David*, was *iniquitie*: and yet *Shimei* deſireth (neither doth he herein deſire any thing ſinfull or unlawfull on *Davids* part to grant) that it might not be *imputed*, as, or for *iniquity* unto him. So when *Iob* pleading with *God*. *Iob* 33. 10. ſaith that *God counted* him for his enemy: he doth not charge *God* fooliſhly, or affirme any thing unworthy of him: and yet *Iob* was not *Gods* enemy, though it be here ſaid, that *God counted* him ſo, or, for ſuch. Therefore the *phraſe* of *counting* or *imputing*, even when it is applyed to *God* himſelfe, doth not alwayes ſignifie ſuch an act of *judgement* or *eſtimation*, as Mr. *W.* deſcribeth.

So in the *New Teſtament*, where it is ſaid *Rom.* 2. 26. that the *uncircumciſion* (*viz.* of the *Heathen* keeping the *Law*) ſhall be *counted* for *circumciſion*, it is meant of *God* himſelfe, that it ſhall be ſo *counted* by him. Yet no man I conceive, (except perhaps Mr. *W.*) will ſay, that *uncircumciſion*, is *circumciſion* indeed. Where *God* is ſaid; not to *impute ſinne* (*viz.* to perſons *beleeving*, and conſequently *juſtified*) as *Rom.* 4. 8. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. the meaning is not, that *God* doth not *judge* or *eſteeme* a *beleever* to have *ſinne* in him (which were an act of *judgement* or *eſtimation*, whereby the thing were *judged* to be, as it is indeed:) but by *Gods* not *imputing ſinne*, is

meant *Gods* gracious absolving, or discharging such men from *guilt*, and *punishment* due unto *sinne*. Therefore to *impute sinne* to a man (in *Scripture phrase*) and so to *impute righteousnes*, signifies an act of a farre differing nature and *importance*, from that which Mr. *W.* layes downe, *viz.* an act of *iudgement*, and whereby a man *iudgeth* and *esteemeth* a thing to be, as indeed it is. *God iudgeth* or *esteemeth* (by an act of knowledge or understanding) every thing to bee, as it is indeed: and yet he *counteth* one thing for another, which it is not indeed (as you have heard) and so he *imputeth* one thing for another, which it is not indeed. Take Mr. owns *Ws.* one *tenet* or *supposition*: the truth hereof will appeare no where more evident then in that. *God* (saith Mr. *W.*) *imputeth* the *righteousnes* of *Christ* unto us, for our *righteousnes*, that is, for that *righteousnes* which we should have performed in our persons. And yet who will affirme (except the before excepted) that the personall *righteousnes* of *Christ* is the *righteousnes* indeed, which wee should have performed in our owne persons? It may be a *righteousnesse* of the same nature and kind: and yet be farre from being the same *righteousnes* indeed, which requires all the same individuating circumstances, as of time, person, number and nature of acts &c. Therefore how importune is Mr. *W.* in bringing in that *Epiphonêma* here, *Gods thoughts are alwayes iust, and his iudgement according to truth*, as if *Gods imputing righteousnes* to him that is a *sinner*, and hath no *righteousnes*, were an act of *iniustice* in him, and contrary to truth: or as if he had to doe with one, that denyed either directly or indirectly, either expressely or by consequence, the one or the other. *Gualter*, an *Orthodox* and learned *Interpreter*, findes grace and favour, not strictnesse of *iudgement*, in the *phrase* of *imputation*. *Docet imputandi verbum* (saith he in his 20. *Homily* upon the *Romans*) *posse Deum suo ergà nos intenti, gratia verò eius hoc nos debere, quòd aliter nobiscum agit, quàm nos meruimus*, that is, the *phrase* of *imputation* teacheth us, that

that *God* might indeed have dealt in ſtrictneſſe of *iudgement* with us, and that we are indebted to his free *grace*, that he dealeth not with us as wee have deſerved. But concerning the ſignification or *importance* of the *word*, or *phraſe imputing*, (in the buſines of *iuſtification*) more afterwards. In the meane time let us examine Mr. *Ws.* dexterity, in explaining the third word, *Righteouſnes*: Surely we ſhall find him no where more left-handed then here. If I knew where his *Logick* or *Rhetorick* were, they deſerv'd a chiding, to give no better attendance upon their Maſter, where he had ſuch occaſion to have uſed them. But in their abſence, this is the beſt *explica-*
„ *tion* of the *word*, *righteouſnes*, he can afford us. By
„ *righteouſnes* (ſaith he) is here meant *Euangelicall righ-*
„ *teouſnes* (which is oppoſed to the legall *righteouſnes*
„ of *works*, which is *inherent* in every man, and is eve-
„ ry mans fulfilling the *Law* in his own perſon) even the
„ perfect *ſatisfaction* and *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, our
„ *Mediatour* and ſurety, which hee the Sonne of *God*,
„ in mans nature performed to the Law, *&c. p.* 11. Riddle mee, riddle me, what's this? For

Firſt can *Faith* in any *ſence*, proper, *tropicall*, *Metonymicall* (let beggers themſelves be chuſers here) be ſaid to be *imputed* to us for the *ſatisfaction*, or *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*? I thought Mr. *Ws.* opinion had bin, that this *ſatisfaction* or *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, had beene *imputed* to us for ſome other thing, but no other thing *imputed* for it. And indeed what (in reaſon) can bee conceived ſhould be *imputed* unto us, for, or inſtead of the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*? eſpecially according to Mr. *Ws. notion* of *imputation*, wherein it is required, that the thing *imputed*, be truely, really, and indeed the ſame, with that for *which it is imputed*. *Surely there is nothing truely really & indeed the ſame with the ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, but this *ſatisfaction* it ſelf. And whether any thing may properly be ſaid, to be truly & indeed the ſame with it ſelf, I refer to Mr. *Ws.* owne determination, when his *Logique* returnes againe to him. However, if by *righteouſnes* (in this

place) he will needs understand the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, here is a relapse into his former acute interpretation, and makes the current of the place this: *Faith* that is, the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, is *imputed to us for righteousnes*, that is, for the *righteousnes* of *Christ*.

Hic furor haud dubius: hæc est manifesta phrenesis.

Secondly why he should call the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, an *Euangelicall righteousnes*, and that with such *emphaticall opposition* to the *legall*, and yet define a *legall righteousnes* to be, *every mans fulfilling of the Law* in his owne person, I want Mr. *Ws. intellect* to comprehend. Surely *Christs righteousnes was a fulfilling of the Law in his owne person:* I doe not know (nor I thinke Mr. *VV.* himselfe, though he knowes so much more then I doe) any other man that perform'd it for him, yea himselfe (in the close of this period) acknowledgeth it to have beene performed by himselfe unto the *Law*.

Thirdly, whereas he affirmes a *legall righteousnes* of *workes* to be inherent in every mans person, it may bee he consulted with his own *Logick* about his expression: but surely other mens never advised him so to speake. *Workes* or *actions* are matters *transient*, not *inherent*.

Fourthly, why he should say that to be *inherent* in every man, which was never *inherent* in any man, (no not in his owne *sence* of *inherency*) *Christ* onely excepted, I beleeve it would a little trouble him, to give a faire accompt.

Fiftly, why he should affirme the *Euangelicall righteousnes* of *Christ* to be a *satisfaction* performed to the *Law*, if himselfe can give no better reason then I can, it must either passe by *authority*, and by *vertue* of the *writ*, *Ipse dixit*, or else be arrested and staied. For though the *active obedience* or *righteousnes* of *Christ*, may be called a *satisfaction* to the *Law*, in as much as the *Law* requires such *obedience* from all men: and that properly is a *satisfaction*

tisfaction either to a person or thing, when the whole is given, that is required or demanded. But how the *death* or *passive obedience* of *Christ* (which I conceive Mr. *W.* chiefly intendeth, in the *word satisfaction*) should bee a *satisfaction* performed to the *Law*, it will take more of my thoughts to apprehend, then yet I have leysure to bestow upon it. The *Law* was *satisfied* in that perfect and intire *obedience*, which *Christ* exhibited to it, from the beginning of his life to the end: and did not require of him (no more then it doth of any other man that shall fulfill it, as hee did) that he should be made a *curse*, or dye the death. If Mr. *Ws.* meaning bee, that the death of *Christ* was a *satisfaction* performed to the *Law* for us, or on our behalfe, in respect of our *sinnes*: I answere that he doth not yet hit the joint: for this is no part of the demands of the Law, that an *innocent* or *righteous* person should dye, but onely the *transgressors* and *disobedient*. Therefore when a *righteous* person dieth, it is rather a crossing, then a *satisfaction* to the *Law*: because the *Law* promiseth life, to those that keep and fulfill it, & doth no wayes threaten or impose death upon them. It is true, the death of *Christ* was satisfactory for the sinnes of the world; but to whom was it a *satisfaction*? not to the *Law*, which neither required, nor demanded it, nor yet had any power to release, or discharge her *Prisoners*, and condemned ones, upon the tender and payment of it: the *Law* knowes no *satisfaction*. But to *God* (the *Law giver*) who had a power over and beyond his *Law*, it was a *satisfaction*, because hee indeed required it, and to him it was tendred and performed. such

Sixtly (and lastly) this Dedalian Divine, makes no clever worke, when he jumbles together the *active*, and *passive*, *obedience of Christ*, and sets the *passive* before the *active*, and subjecteth them to the same consideration, in respect of their performance to the *Law*. But his greater oversights are good for nothing, except it be to over-

ſhadow his leſſer, therefore it is pitty this priviledge ſhould be denyed unto them.

I conceive by this time Mr *Ws.* owne heart ſmites him, and tel's him, that he hath not quitted himſelfe in the opening of his *Scriptures*, anſwerably to the confidence repoſed in him, by thoſe that choſe him for their Champion. *Pauls imputation* is yet a ſecret; notwithſtanding, Mr *Ws.* interpretation hath paſſed upon it, yea, by tampering with a falſe key, he hath made the Lock harder to open then it was before. If any man or Woman, long's for contradictions, or other abſurdities of the blood, I can yet relieve them out of this tract of Mr *Ws.* Anſwere before I leave it.

Pag. 6 he affirmeth, (and that truely as I conceive) *Faith* to be the firſt & *radical grace* and *vertue* of *renovation*: and yet *pag* 5. in his definition of *faith*, he ſuppoſeth the Subject or perſon in whom it is wrought, to be *regenerate*, (which is as much doubtleſſe, as renewed) before. Againe, *pag* 9. he affirmeth, that *God* doth accompt and judge of all *perſons* and *things*, ſo as they are, and yet *pag* 11. granteth, that *God* counted *Iob* his enemy, which he was not. *So p.* 5. he defines, & affirmes that *faith* which is here ſayd to be *imputed* for *righteouſneſſe*, to be the ſupernaturall *guift* and *grace* of *beleeving*: and yet *pag* 8. he ſaith, that *God imputes* a *righteouſnes* which neither conſiſts in any *worke*, or *workes*, nor in any *grace*, or *vertue inherent*. and *pag.* 12. by *imputing faith* for *righteouſneſſe*, he ſaith, is meant *Gods* ſetting of *Chriſts righteouſneſſe* on the *skore*, and putting it on the *accounts* of every *true beleever*, &c.

Atq; idem jungat vulpes, et mulgeat hircos.

This man can Foxes yoke in Plough,
And make wild Goates give Milk enough.

But thus much for contradictions in this place; and I thinke

thinke well too (all th ings conſidered.) *Pag* 7 and 8. Pretending to define that *Faith*, which the *Apoſtle* ſaith is *imputed* for *righteouſneſſe*: he defines a ſtrong *Faith*, or *Faith* in the higheſt degree. So that if Mr *Ws. Divinity* were *Goſpel*, woe to the weake-faith'd *Chriſtian*, (how true ſoever his *Faith* ſhould be) he muſt to Hell notwithſtanding: ſuch *faith* is not capable of *Pauls imputation* for *righteouſneſſe*: for *pag* 6. in laying downe the ſecond difference (as he calls it) betweene the *faith* the Apoſtle meaneth, and the naturall habit or power of *faith*, he affirmeth, the *Spirit* of *God* in working that *faith*, confirmes the heart with CONFIDENCE, AND FIRME PERSWASION; you ſhall find words of like importance in the very definition it ſelfe, which he gives of this *faith pag* 6. I will not be troubleſome to him, in deſiring him to ſhew his licenſe, for making the 4 Kings ſlaughtered by *Abraham*, ſo mighty, *p* 7. Onely this I ſay, that in ſuch his advancement of their *puiſſance*, and *greatnes*, he doth not Dogmatize with my Authors, nor with the common opinion, which makes the Kings of thoſe times, in compariſon of the Kings that now are on Earth, but as Graſſchoppers, in reſpect of Gyants: nor (as far as I am able to apprehend) with the *Scriptures* themſelves, which make five ſeverall Kings of five Cities, which were Scituate no great diſtance the one from the other, and beſides ſome of them, none of the largeſt, *Gen.* 14. 2. Laſtly, *pag* 12. where he ſaith, that *God* ſets *Chriſt righteouſneſſe* on the *skore*, and puts it on the *accompt* of every true *beleever*: I would gladly know, whether his meaning be, that *God* accounteth every *beleever* to have done and ſuffered, the things which *Chriſt* did and ſuffered, or what other tollerable conſtruction or meaning can be fitted to thoſe expreſſions. If *God* puts the *righteouſneſſe* it ſelfe, of *Chriſt*, upon a *beleevers skore*, he muſt put the merit of it alſo upon the ſame *skore*, for theſe are inſeparable. If he puts the merit of *Chriſts righteouſneſſe* upon this *skore*, he muſt put all the *fruites* and *effects* of this

this merit alſo; for theſe likewiſe are as inſep arable as the other. And ſo *God* ſhall accompt every true *believer* to have *redeemed*, *juſtified*, and *ſaved* the *world*.

For the confirmation of this expoſition, and juſtifying of this truth, &c.

M. W. fromp. 120 15.

Here the Anſwerer buckles on his *harneſſe*, and meanes to fight ſtoutly for his beloved *Dalila*, the beautifull interpretation hitherto given by him, of the words in queſtion: onely I deſire you to remember, and to carry ſteadily, and diſtinctly in minde with you, what this *interpretation* was, that ſo you may the better diſcern and judg, how cloſe the ſute of his Arguments and proofes, ſits upon the back of his *interpretation* to be proved. The Summe and effect of his *interpretation* (as you have heard) and if any thing can be made of it, this is) *Faith aprehending Chriſt or the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, is imputed to a believer, for the Evangelicall righteouſneſſe of Chriſt.* Now let us ſee how he laye's about him, and with what ſingular *Dexterity*, and *learning*, he proves twiſe fifteene, to make juſt three and twenty.

is this

The firſt *Argument* (ſaith he) is drawne from the wordes of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 2. 26. &c. He may well ſay, his *Argument* is *drawne*, and might have added, *Obtorto collo*, by head and ſhoulders: the man in forging this *argument*, labours (as it were) in the very fire, and though he gives it heat upon heat, yet he brings it to no ſhape or perfection at all, at the laſt, but is in the managing of it, as a wild Bull in a Net (which is the prophet *Eſay's* compariſon in another caſe) who beates and teares himſelfe with ſtrugling, but knowes not how to expedite or deliver himſelfe ever the more. If a mans reaſon, wits, or underſtanding, had offended him, Mr. *W.* hath provided rods of Scorpions in the carriage of this *Argument*, to ſcourge them with. I might very lawfully excuſe my ſelfe from ſaying any thing by way of

of Anſwere to this *Argument*, by authority of that ſaying,

Quod non vult intelligi, debet negligi, that is,

Vnderſtood what will not be,
To neglect you may be free.

Mr. *W.* himſelfe I hope will (in part) excuſe me, if I cannot find out the quadrature of his circle: I confeſſe I was never made for that ſpeculation, neither take I any contentment to fiſh in ſuch troubled waters? However, ſomething muſt be done, Gameſters muſt play bad games and hard caſts, as well as good.

The *Scripture* Mr. *W.* ſo largely inſiſt's upon, to prove his *interpretation* of the former, *viz.* that *faith* (in a *tropicall ſenſe*, that is, as it ſignifieth the *righteouſneſſe* of *Chriſt*) is *imputed* to a *beleever*, for the *Evangelicall righteouſneſſe* of *Chriſt* is this: *Rom.* 2. 26. *If the uncircumciſion keepe the righteouſneſſe of the Law, ſhall not his uncircumciſion be counted for circumciſion?* Surely this *Scripture*, if it were well managed, would do good Service towards the pulling downe of the ſaid *Interpretation*, but for the building of it up, it can do none at all, till it ſelfe be pulled downe; I meane the *true ſenſe* and *meaning* of it deſtroyed, which Mr *W.* labours hard, and with both his hands to doe in this place; and yet when he hath done all, he hath (upon the matter) done nothing. For if all the particulars were granted in the firſt and moſt liberall manner, for which he contendeth about the meaning of this *Scripture*, yet would they operate no more, then what might be ſumm'd up in a Cypher, towards the eſtabliſhing of the other *interpretation*, (which is the thing intended by him) as will evidently appeare to a conſidering *Reader*. What if he could prove that here were *trope*, upon *trope*, and mountaines of *metonymies*; doth this prove a neceſſity of finding either the ſame *number*, or the ſame kind of

fullest

tropes

tropes or *figures*, in an other *Scripture*? And yet in this conſequence, lieth the beſt part of the *ſtrength* and *ſinewes* of Mr. *Ws.* Argument from this place.

But let us make ſomething of nothing, as well as we can, and give you a taſt of his profound *interpretation* of this *Scripture*. By *uncircumciſion* (ſaith he) in the former clauſe, we cannot underſtand the *foreskin* of the *fleſh* &c. (but a *Gentile* not *circumciſed*, &c.) By the ſame word in the latter clauſe, not the *foreskin*, or *uncircumciſion*, in a *proper ſenſe* &c. but the *ſtate* and *condition* of him that is *uncircumciſed*, and yet not this neither barely conſidered in it *ſelfe*, but as *comprehending* in it the *righteouſneſſe* of the *Law*, &c. And yet immediately he adds, that this word further in this very place, ſignifieth the man in the *ſtate* of *uncircumciſion*, keeping the *righteouſneſſe* of the *Law*, and yet this *figuratively* too, for the *righteouſnes* of the *Law*, by him performed. I thinke we are in the Quagmires or quick-ſands already, but let us goe forward, and we ſhall be ſure to be in be-
he fore we have done. By *circumciſion* (ſaith he further towards the opening of this *Scripture*) we cannot underſtand, the outward cutting away, of the *foreskin* of the *fleſh*, &c. but by *circumciſion* is here meant the *circumciſion* of the *heart*, in the *ſpirit*. The word λογισθήται ſhall be *counted*, ſignifies (in a *full ſenſe*) *judging*, *counting*, *accepting*, and uſing accordingly. Thus we have (with much adoe) ſpelled Mr. *Ws. interpretation* of this *Scripture*. Now let us put together, and ſee what we have gotten. *If a Gentile not circumciſed, keepe the Law, ſhall not his ſtate and condition, not barely conſidered in it ſelfe, but as comprehending in it, the righteouſneſſe of the Law*, that is, The man in the ſtate of *uncircumciſion*, keeping the *righteouſnes* of the *Law*, that is, the *righteouſnes* of the *Law* by him performed, be *judged*, *accepted*, and uſed accordingly, as the *circumciſion* of the *heart* in the *Spirit*? This is the expreſſe *tenor*, and *carriage* of his *expoſition* of this *Scripture*, conceived in his owne words, with-

our

out either adding any thing, or diminiſhing any thing, (to my knowledge) which ſhould make matters any whit worſe, or more exorbitant, from *ſenſe* or *reaſon*, then as himſelfe hath delivered them. Something I have left out, which would be as Oyle to encreaſe the fire, and would burden the *interpretation* further, as *viz.* where he brings up a falſe report upon *Gods gracious intent*, in giving the *Sacrament*, or *Seale* of *circumciſion*, to the *Jewes*. It was (ſaith he) an obligation, by which the „ *circumciſed* was bound under paine of cutting off fore- „ ver, to performe the whole *Law*, and to prove this „ ſo irrationall, and extravagant a ſuppoſition, hee „ miſuſeth that *Scripture*, *Gal.* 5.3. I teſtifie to every man „ that is *circumciſed*, that he is a debtor to doe the „ whole *Law*, which place doth not ſpeake of any obligation upon men from *God*, to doe the whole *Law*, under paine of damnation, or cutting off for ever, for then miſerable had the caſe and condition bin of the whole *Nation* of the *Iewes*, who generally, from the time when *circumciſion* was firſt given by *God*, to their Father *Abraham*, were *circumciſed* till now, and yet certainely none of them performed the whole *Law*, but failed or offended more or leſſe, in many things (as *Iames* ſpeaketh) and ſo by the cruel Sword of Mr. *Ws. interpretation*, muſt be all cut off from *God* for ever. But the Apoſtles meaning clearely in this *Scripture* is to ſhew, that if any man were *circumciſed* in ſuch a way, or with any ſuch purpoſe or intent, as the *Iewiſh teachers* of *circumciſion* amongſt them urged, and preſſed them unto: that is, with a conceipt of the neceſſitie thereof to *juſtification*; then were they in *reaſon* bound, as wel to obſerve all other points of the *Law*, as that of *circumciſion*, there being no ground to hope they ſhould be *juſtified*, by the obſervation of one thing in the *Law*, if any other were neglected. For the rule of *God* in this caſe is, *Curſed be he that continueth not in all things that are written in the Law, to doe them.* This is *Calvins expoſition* of this

place, or very little differing from it. But when men crie out againſt *reaſon*, as the Anſwerer in great paſſion doth, in the ſequel of his diſcourſe, they receive but a juſt *recompence*, of reward, to be delivered up into the hand of *Non-ſenſe*. But let *Non-ſenſe* ſay what it will, the man will not be daſh'd out of countenance, by it, but wil need's ſet this Crown of fine *Gold*, upon the head of his Leaden *interpretation*, ſtrike it off who dares, and makes him a Rebel, or Traytor, that ſhall riſe up againſt it. This *ſenſe*, and *meaning*, of the wordes and of this *phraſe*, is „ ſo cle are, and manifeſt, and ſo perfectly agreeable „ to all true *reaſon*, that none can deny it, unleſſe he will „ ſet himſelfe to rebell againſt the *light*. I thought „ he would have lik'd his *interpretation* the worſe, for being agreeable to any *reaſon*, and ſo would any other man thinke, that ſhall but read his invective. *Pag* 27. againſt that great enemie of his, which ſtill thwarteth, and contradicteth him, in moſt of his *undertakings*, *Right Reaſon*. And it doth no leſſe in this place, though here he would faine be friends, and ſcrape acquaintance with it.

But when he comes to *parallel* the *Scripture* laſt *interpreted* by him (as you have heard) and his *interpretation* thereof, with the *Scriptures* in queſtion, and attempts a conformity betweene them in their *interpretations*, he falls into ſuch a *Rhetoricall* rage and fury, and buffets his reader, ſo thick and ſo faſt, with *tropes*, and *figures*, that it is not for a meane man to come neare his meaning (at leaſt if his meaning be mans meat, any thing prepared for the *underſtanding*) by 40 foot. He had need have *Angels* for his readers, or men of *Angelicall comprehenſions*, otherwiſe his tyrannicall and ſterne *Oratory*, will be ready to laugh them in the face to ſcorne: Onely thus much, a man of low *apprehenſions*, and that wants both *Logique*, and *Rhetorique*, (as Mr. *W.* lamentably complaines, *pag* 28. 29. that his adverſary doth) may evidently perceive; that here with his left handed

Retorique

Retorique, he quite pulls downe the good *interpretation* of the word *Faith*, or *beleeving* (in his *Scripture*) which he had formerly built up with his right-handed *reaſon*. For if you looke back to *pag* 6. there you ſhall find him with this deſcription of that *faith*, or *beleeving*, which is here ſayd to be *imputed* to *Abraham* for *righteouſneſſe*. Here by *Faith* we are to underſtand, that *ſupernaturall guift*, and *grace* of *beleeving*, wrought in the *Elect* by the *Spirit*, *&c.* Which whether it be a *deſcription*, or *definition* of *faith properly* (yea, moſt *properly*) taken, I am not much afrayd to make the party himſelfe Iudge. Yet in this place *page.* 14. (*heu regni*, „ *rerumq́, oblitus ſuarum*, *alas* forgetfull of his great „ affaires? he delivers (or rather indeed, intangles) „ himſelfe thus. We muſt by *Abrahams beleeving*, „ by a *metalepſis*, or double *trope*, underſtand *Abra-* „ *hams* ſtanding in the ſtate of a *true beleever*, *uni-* „ *ted*, *&c.* And preſently after, By *Faith imputed*, or „ *counted* for *righteouſnes*, we muſt not underſtand, *faith* „ in a *proper ſenſe*, but by a double *trope*, for the *eſtate* „ and *condition*, of a *true faithfull man &c.*

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?
It's hard to know what knot to tye,
To make wild *Proteus* skill to lie. still

If *Abrahams* ſtanding in the *ſtate* of a true *beleever*, *united*, *&c.* be that *ſupernaturall guift*, and *grace* of *beleeving*, wrought in the *Elect*, by the *Spirit*, *&c.* (as Mr. *W.* hath ſynonymized them) *Xanthe retropropera*, *&c.* Let *Xanthus* backward run, and Rivers all turne head-upon their Fountaines--Yea, the man is ſo intemperate in *contradictions*, that in the very next *page*, towards the „ cloſe he affirmeth, that which (ineffect) he had 7 times „ denyed before, *viz.* That the *faith* of that man „ which doth not reſt on his owne *workes* for *juſtifica-* „ *tion*, as *comprehending* in it *Chriſt* and his *righteouſnes*,

is counted for *righteouſnes* unto him, becauſe it ſettles him in the *ſtate* of a *righteous man*: which tenet, according to the plaine, and direct importance of the words, If it be Mr. *VVs.* opinion, and judgement indeed, in this controverſie; I cannot ſufficiently wonder, what *oracle* he conſulted with, about this *ſerious* and *ſad* War he hath made againſt thoſe Notes of mine I left with him, which I know as certainely have nothing in them, little nor much, againſt this opinion; as I know that Mr. *VV.* hath miſuſed them with his yron intellect. I paſſe by many other things, which the *Anſwerer* hath let fall in the carriage of this his firſt *Argument*, *obnoxious* enough to the *obeliſque*, becauſe I would deliver both my ſelfe and reader, upon as good termes of diſpatch, as conveniently may be.

Mr. *W.* p. 15. 16. *A ſecond Argument to confirme the expoſitions, is drawne from the Apoſtles wordes: ver.* 4. *The ſtrength of this argument (if it hath any) may be conſidered of, in this Syllogiſme.*

> *That thing which is counted for righteouſnes, bringeth with it a reward to the beleever, which is counted not of debt, but of grace (which reward is eternall life, as he rightly enough ſuppoſeth.)*
>
> But *it is the righteouſnes and ſatiſfaction of* Chriſt, *not faith, that brings the reward of eternall life with it.*
>
> Therefore *it is the righteouſnes and ſatisfaction of* Chriſt, *and not faith, that is imputed for righteouſnes to a beleever.*

I *anſwere*, firſt to the *Propoſition*, by diſtinguiſhing that *expreſſion*, bringeth with it a reward, out of it's ambiguity, whereof the *Diſputer* makes his whole advantage in this *Argument* (being indeed his owne *Language*, and not the *Language* of that *Scripture*, upon which he pretends

pretends to build his *Argument*) A thing may be ſayd to bring with it a reward, two ſeverall waies at leaſt (beſides many others,) either firſt by way of *voluntary* and free *Covenant*, or *compact*; or ſecondly, by way of *merit*, or juſt *retribution*, and *compenſation*. As for example, a man may promiſe to as many as he pleaſeth, that if they will but come over the way to him, he will give them the ſame money or reward, upon their coming, which the *Law* appointeth (or which *equity* and *conſcience* would allow) to a Labourer for 7 dayes worke or Labour. In this caſe, the croſſing the way onely, by vertue of the promiſe made upon ſuch termes, brings the ſame reward with it, which the labour, and travaile of 7 dayes doth. If Mr *W.* takes the phraſe of bringing with it a reward in the former *ſenſe*, *viz.* by way of *Covenant*, the *propoſition* is granted for truth: but then his *aſſumption* will halt right downe; Becauſe *Faith* brings with it a reward in this *ſenſe*, as well as the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt* doth in the other. If he meanes the clauſe in the other *ſenſe*, *viz.* by way of *merit*: ſo the *propoſition* is to be arreſted for *falſhood*; for that which is accounted for *righteouſnes*, doth not neceſſarily bring with it a reward, upon ſuch termes, or in ſuch a way. *God* in a *gracious*, and free *Covenant*, hath promiſed the ſame (if not greater) reward, to thoſe that ſhall beleeve in *Ieſus Chriſt*, which he hath promiſed to thoſe that ſhall keepe the whole *Law*.

To the *Aſſumption* I likewiſe anſwere, that it is ſick of that common diſeaſe in argumentation, which they call, *fallacia diviſionis*. Thoſe things are divided and put aſunder, which *God* hath joyned together, *viz.* *Chriſt* and *Faith*, in bringing the great reward of eternall life unto the creature. See *Ioh.* 3. 16. *Ioh.* 6. 40. *Rom.* 5. 1, 2. beſides other places (without number) of like importance: in all which, *Faith* or *beleeving* in *Chriſt*, is found in perfect conjunction with *Chriſt* himſelfe, (not in *oppoſition* to him, as here it is) about the

matter

matter of *iuſtification* and *ſalvation*. It's true, there is an *oppoſition* betweene *Chriſt* and *Faith*, even in the buſineſſe of *iuſtification*; but this is in the manner, not in the matter it ſelfe of *iuſtification*: for both *iuſtifie Chriſt* and *faith* (*Rom* 5. 1,2.) and conſequently, both bring eternall life: but *Chriſt* doth it in that way which is meet for him and proper to him, and *Faith* doth it in another way proper to it. *Chriſt iuſtifieth*, by way of merit, *ſatisfaction*, and *attonement*-making with *God* for *ſinne*: *Faith iuſtifieth*, as ordained by *God* to bring men into *Communion* and *fellowſhip* of that *ranſome*, *attonement*, or *ſatisfaction* which *Chriſt* hath made. Therefore this *minor propoſition* alſo is manifeſtly falſe, which makes an *oppoſition* betweene *Chriſt* and *Faith* in *iuſtification* it ſelfe (wherein the *Scriptures* ſtill make them to accord) whereas the *oppoſition* that is betweene them, ſtands in the ſeverall manner, or diverſity of *influence* into the ſame *iuſtification*.

His third *argument* followeth, which is built cleane beſides the *foundation* it claimeth, which is the ſixt and ſeventh *verſes* of this *Chapter*, where *God* is ſaid to *impute righteouſnes* without *workes* to him that *beleeveth*. This *Argument*, if any thing at all can bee made of it, (which indeed is very little) muſt riſe up in this forme of reaſon.

If the thing *imputed* by *God*, be *righteouſnes*, and no *righteouſnes* elſe is to bee found amongſt mankind, but *Chriſts* perfect *righteouſnes* onely, then muſt the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, needs be that which is *imputed* for *righteouſnes*.

Sed verum prius: ergo & poſterius.

premiſes

To this *argument* I anſwere. Firſt that the concluſion which he here raiſeth from the *premiſes*, *viz.* that *Chriſts righteouſnes* muſt needs be that which is *imputed* for *righteouſnes* to a *beleever*, is *diametrally* oppoſite to himſelfe, in ſeverall paſſages of this diſcourſe alrea-

dy

dy examined, and particularly to what hee affirmed towards the close of his first *argument*, *viz.* that the *Faith* of a man, which doth not rest on his owne *workes* for *justification*, comprehending in it *Christ* and his *righteousnes*, is *imputed* for *righteousnes* unto him. Surely *faith* comprehending the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, and *righteousnes* of *Christ* comprehended by *Faith*, are as farre differing one from the other, as Mr. *Ws.* *opinion* and mine are in this controversie, take them at their greatest *elongation*.

Secondly, I answere more particularly and fully, that had Mr. *W.* understood the *Apostles phrase*, of *imputing righteousnes* (*verse* 6.) he would never have sought footing for any such *argument* here. He supposeth, that when *God* is said to *impute righteousnes* to a *beleever*, he must needs have a proper, literall and *preexistent righteousnes* for the matter of such his *imputation*, or otherwise he conceiveth the *Apostles* expression cannot stand, which *supposition* we may number amongst many other Mr. *Ws.* mistakes in this his answere, and yet not doe it the least wrong: For

First it is not here said, that *God imputeth* τὴν δικαιοσύνην (with an article) a *righteousnes*; but indefinitely, and without an article, δικαιοσύνην *righteousnes*, which is a faire intimation (at least) that he doth not here speake of any particular or speciall *righteousnes* fixed in any subject, as the *righteousnes* of *Christ* is.

Secondly if by *righteousnes* here said to bee *imputed* by *God*, be meant the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, then according to the *tenor* of Mr. *Ws.* owne *exposition*, formerly mentioned, the strayne of the *Apostle* in this passage must be this, that *God imputeth the righteousnes of Christ*, for the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, to him that *beleeveth* *see page* 11.

Thirdly, that *imputing righteousnes* to a *beleever*, which is here ascribed to *God* is said to be an *imputing righteousnes*, without *workes*. Now the *righteousnes* of

Christ is so far from being a *righteousnes* without *workes*, that *workes* are the very *substance* and *essence* of it. If it be objected and said, that this is meant concerning a mans owne *works*, that *God imputes* the *righteousnes* of *Christ* unto him, without these, not otherwise; To this I answere, First that such a distinction or limitation as this is, hath no *foundation*, at al either in this or any other *Scripture*. Secondly, here is not the least necessity, or occasion to *invocate* the aid or assistance of any such distinction. Here is no streight or difficultie against which we should be relieved by it. Now to coyne distinctions, where there is neither ground in *Scripture*, nor necessity in reason for it, is no les then (being interpreted) to coyne new *Scriptures*. Thirdly (and lastly) it is but vaine and frivolous, (especially *quoad homines*, in respect of those that maintaine Mr. *Ws.* way of *imputation*, because they hold, that this *righteousnes* of *Christ imputed*; by *vertue* of this *imputation* becomes or is made ours, so, or upon such termes, as if it were in deed, and in truth, properly and personally ours, and performed by our selves. But

Fourthly, if by *righteousnes*, which *God* is here said to *impute*, be meant the *righteousnes* of *Christ*; then is the description or explication of this *imputed righteousnes* which immediately followeth, (*verse* 7. and 8.) very impertinent and unproper, being conceived and layd downe in these three expressions, the *forgivenesse of iniquities*, *the covering of sinnes*, the *not imputing sinne*. The *imputing* of *Christs righteousnes* (in the sence pretended) is much more then the *forgivenesse* of *iniquities*, or the not *imputing sinne*. As the putting on of glorious *apparell* upon a man, is much more, then not to cloath him with *ragges*. Therefore

Fifthly, (and lastly) by *Gods imputing righteousnes* in this place, is meant, onely his *justifying men*, or (according to Mr. *Ws.* owne *Interpretation* of this *Scripture phrase*, *pag.* 10. of this his discourse) a dealing with men, and using them accordingly, as if they were *righteous*. To

impute

mpute righteousnes, is a short *periphrasis*, or *description*, of the *act* of *absolution*, *iustification*, with *reference* to the *rights* and *priviledges*, belonging thereunto, as to *impute* sinne, expresseth the Act of *charge*, or *condemnation*, with *reference* to the *evil* or *punishments* ensuing thereupon. In this *sense* you shall find the very *phrase* of *imputing righteousnesse*, or *righteousnes imputed*, used in the eleventh verse of this *Chapter*, for *passive iustification*, or, being *iustified*, where the *Apostle* hath these words concerning *Abraham*, that he should be the Father, (*i.e.* the grand *example*, *patterne*, or *leader*) of all that beleeve, not being *circumcised*, that *righteousnesse* might be, (or rather should be) *imputed* to them also, that is, that they should be justified as he was. Let the best *Interpreters* be consulted withall about the *sense* of this *phrase*, *Imputing righteousnesse* (in this place), I do not beleeve any one will be found to contradict the *Interpretation* now given, or by *righteousnesse*, to understand the *righteousnes* of *Christ*. Certaine I am, that as far as my short Librarie will reach, I have my *Bookes*, my *Friends*, in this *exposition*: *Ergo justitia Dei* (saith *Musculus* upon the place) *quæ gratis imputatur, est non imputari peccatum*. that is, the *righteousnes* which *God* here freely *imputeth*, is the not *imputation* of sinne, which (according to his *opinion*, againe, and againe, expressed both in this *Chapter*, and elsewhere) is nothing else but *iustification* it selfe. *Notandum est*, (saith he, alittle before the wordes cited) *remissionem pecatorum esse iusticiam nostram*: *i.* It is from hence to be observed, that remission of sinnes is our *righteousnes*, (or *justification*) and so goeth on to *demonstrate* this conclusion from the *context*. For brevities sake, I forbeare other *Authors*, as *Calvin*, *Peter Martyr*, *Gualter*, *&c.* in whose *Commentaries* upon these two places, there is not the least intimation that by the word *righteousnes*, should be meant the *righteousnes* of *Christ*. And thus you see the doome of Mr. *Ws.* third *Argument*, which is, to vanish into nothing.

or fees

His fourth Argument followes, but ſucceeds not, neither: if the Author would have pleaſed to have given it any Shape or forme, it muſt have bin this.

If that which is here ſayd to be *imputed* to *Abraham*, is for *righteouſnes* to *juſtification*, and there be nothing that will ſerve for ſuch *righteouſnes*, but that which is found in *Chriſt* our *mediator*, then muſt ſomewhat in *Chriſt*, here be ſayd to be *imputed* to *Abraham*, and not his *faith*. But the *Antecedent* in this *propoſition*, is true. Therefore the *Conſequent* muſt needs be true alſo; and ſo it muſt be ſomewhat in *Chriſt*, *viz.* his *righteouſnes* that is ſayd here to be *imputed* to *Abraham*.

There is nothing in this *Argument*, but what (for the ſubſtance of it) was contained in the two former, and hath bin already ſufficiently anſwer'd. Not to repeat that which I obſerved in anſwere to his former *Argument*, *viz.* That the concluſion which here he ſeekes to eſtabliſh, makes every whit as much, and as directly againſt himſelfe, as againſt me: I onely add this (to ſtop the mouth of *importunity*) that there is indeed nothing that will ſerve *meritoriouſly* unto *juſtification*, but the *righteouſnes* or *ſatiſfaction* of *Chriſt*; but there are ſeverall things that may ſerve *miniſterially*, or *inſtrumentally* thereunto. The word of *God* may as well, and as properly, be ſayd to *juſtifie* men (*inſtrumentally*) as to give them an *inheritance* amongſt thoſe that are *ſanctified*. *Act.* 20. 32. And ſo the *Miniſter* of *God*, may be as well ſayd to *juſtifie men* (*inſtrumentally*, or *miniſterially*) as to ſave them, which yet is aſcribed to him. 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. And ſo *faith* it ſelfe, (I meane *faith* in *Chriſt*) is in 20 places ſayd, ſometimes to ſave men, ſometimes to *juſtifie* men, *viz.* *inſtrumentally*, or *miniſterially*, being (as it were) the Officer appointed by *God*, to bring men into part and fellowſhip, of that *righteouſnes*, or *juſtification* which *Chriſt* hath purchaſed, and procured, for the world:

world: and is therefore ſayd to be *imputed* unto them for *righteouſnes* (or unto *righteouſnes*, εἰς δικαιοσύνην) becauſe *God* requireth nothing more of them to their *iuſtification*, but onely to *beleeve* in his Son *Ieſus Chriſt*.

Mr. *Ws.* Fift, and laſt *argument*, comes now upon the Stage, but hath ſuch a vizor upon the face of it, that a man cannot tell of what Shape or complexion it is, only thus far the thing is evident, from his owne wordes, that here he *Starts*, or rather *Coniures* up a new Concluſion, as far differing from what he laboured to conclude in his 4 former *arguments*, as the *Eaſt* is from the *Weſt*. For thus he writes here (*ſtylo novo*) that the *imputing*, or *counting* a thing for *righteouſnes*, is no more „ but DECLARING a man thereby to be *righteous*, and giving him the *teſtimony* of *righteouſnes*, &c. And this he labours in the fire, to prove from that *clauſe*, in *Pſal.* 106. *ver.* 31. where *Phineas* zealous act in executing judgement, is ſayd to be *imputed* to him for *righteouſnes*. So that by his reaſoning in this place, he ſeemes plainely to deny, that a man is conſtituted, or made *righteous*, or truely, and really *iuſtified* by the *imputation* of *Chriſts righteouſnes*, or *ſatisfaction* it ſelfe unto him, but onely that he is declared to be ſuch, and to receive a *teſtimony* thereby that he is ſuch. If his meaning be otherwiſe, his words and he are of two mindes. If this be to *reaſon*, or to rove, let reaſonable men judge. But,

Omnis Ariſtippum decuit color, that is,

Brave *Ariſtippus* all things did become.

Yet doth not the *Scripture* he alledgeth, prove that *heterogeneall concluſion* of his, for that *Clauſe*, of *Gods imputing* that zealous act of his for *righteouſnes*, doth not import any teſtimony from *God*, of his *perſonall righteouſneſſe*

ouſneſſe, or of his juſtified *eſtate* before *God*, but onely of the *righteouſneſſe* or juſtifiableneſſe of that particular act. *Videbatur* (ſaith *Muſculus* upon the place) *factũ Phineas et crudele in ſe, et temerariũ reſpectu perſonæ: Ideo ex ipſo ore Dei, &c. i.e.* This fact of *Phineas* ſeem'd cruell in itſelfe, and raſh, in reſpect of the *perſon*: wherefore it was expreſſed by the mouth of *God himſelfe*, that he was *righteouſly zealous*, and had the honour of the *Prieſthood*, added; as a teſtimony that that his fact was approved of *God*. If I were in Mr. *W's.* caſe, I could not tell how to bring over this *Orthodox Author* to me, in ſuch an *interpretation*: but *Autolycus* had an art to make

Candida de ingris, et de candentibus atra.

White Cowes of black, and black of white againe.

„ In the concluſion of this *Argument*, he tells us, „ (in effect) that were it not for feare of writing a large „ *volume*, he would inſiſt upon *humane teſtimonies*, and „ the *opinions* of *Orthodox expoſitors*, for the further „ proofe of his *expoſition*. So that (it ſeemes) he hath hitherto inſiſted onely upon *himſelfe*, and his owne *opinion*, in his *expoſition*, which I verily beleeve: and for his *humane teſtimonies*, whereof (*Fencer-like*) he boaſts. I am full of jealouſie, that they would prove no better then his *Divine teſtimonies* have bin, which (as you have ſeen) have bin as little to his purpoſe, as his adverſary could wiſh them.

Mr. *W.* pag. 18, 19. &c. *The Confutation of the falſe expoſition made by* Socinus, *and other Heretiques, his Diſciples, as* Wotton, Goodwin, *and their Companions.*

Bona verba quæſo, Good Sir, good wordes I pray you. I am ſorry, you ſhould turne a Heretique-maker in your old dayes; you had better (a great deale) make Candle

dle-ſticks. The *Pope* makes Saints, and Mr. *W.* makes Heretiques; which (thinke we) is the honeſter Profeſſion? as for their *Art* and *Authority*, in their Profeſſions, I take them to be much the ſame. How either *Wotton*, or *Goodwin*, became either *Heretiques*, or *Diſciples* of *Socinus*, or why they ſhould be ſo accounted or called, the accuſer of his Brethren doth not ſhew.

But though Mr. *W.* might make bold to ſacrifice the *Name* and *Credit* of that hiobular fellow, *Goodwin*, upon the ſervice of his furious fancy; it may be, he might thinke him good for little elſe: yet the *worth*, *learning*, and *reputation*, of the other, might have bin a bridle in his lips, to have kept him from falling ſo foule upon him, eſpecially having now taken Sanctuary in the Grave: which ſhould be a privileged place (at leaſt for the Servants of *God*) from the rage of tongues. triobulac

Mr *Wotton* was a man I never knew (by face); but as well by his *writings*, as by the *generall report*, and *teſtimony*, of thoſe that knew him, and ſomebody elſe, It is eaſie to determine which was the *Thiſtle*, and which the *Cedar* in *Lebanon*.

Θερσίτης δ' ὅτι μοῦνος ἀμετροεπὴς ἀκολώα,
Ὅς ῥ' ἔπεα φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε ἔδη
Μάψ, ἀτὰρ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἐριζέμεναι βασιλεῦσι.

Therſites yet alone would needs with foule mouth bluſter,
Who knew to ſpeak at large, but to his owne diſgrace,
'Gainſt Princes vainely with bold words to fluſter,
&c.

But how *unſavory*, *importune*, and *impudent*, Mr *W's.* charge of *Socinianiſme* upon the other, and the *opinion* maintain'd by him in this *controverſie*, is, hath been diſcovered already, and (I thinke) ſo fully, that Mr. *W.* will

will have much adoe to cover it againe. Beſides, in making me *Socinian*, and *Heretick*, for what I hold concerning the *imputation* of *faith*, he cloatheth himſelfe with the ſame ſhame, affirming the very ſame thing which I doe herein, more then once and againe, in this his worthy *Anſwere*. And whether that which was obſerved in the beginning of his fifth and laſt *Argument*, doth not ſmell ranker and ſtronger, of the *Socinian* Dunghill, then any thing that ever was maintained by me, I referre to men that have their *noſes* about them, to judge.

Concerning his *Confutation*, of the falſe *expoſition*, made by *Socinus*, *Goodwin*, *Wotton*, *&c.* (as he pretendeth) upon which he very bountifully beſtoweth 8 whole *pages* and upwards, I verily beleeve, that none of all the three, nor any of their companions (as the courteſie of his pen complements with he knowes not whom) ever conceived, or delivered that *expoſition*, upon which he poureth out his wrath in black, in ſo laſting a *ſtorme*: but it is a man of Paper, made and ſet up by himſelfe, to exerciſe his *Artillerie*, and to keepe his hand in ure. And therefore it is pitty to trouble him in all this diſcourſe, ſince he doth no body any harme, but onely finds himſelfe exerciſe, and imployment, with his owne ſhadow. As for the other two, I ſhall leave them to ſtand or fall, (in this *expoſition*) by their owne writings, onely this I cannot but think and ſay, that Mr. *W.* ſurely rather dreames, then reades what mens *opinions*, and *Interpretations* are: yea though, he hath their *Bookes* and *writings*, before him, yet he ſeemes feerefull to *truſt*, or *beleeve* theſe, and thinkes it more ſafe to relie upon one ſtragling *imagination* of his owne, for the certaintie of their *opinions*, then upon the plaineſt, and moſt expreſſe words uttered by themſelves. If I were to begin againe, I would not reaſon with ſuch a Spirit for Shoo-buckles.

But for this *tempeſtuous*, and *fulminant* quarter, of his diſcourſe, wherein he layes on ſore, where it lights

(but

(but that is no where but on his owne fancie) I ſhall paſſe the lighter over it, (that ſo I may haſten to what he hath in particular charge againſt me) becauſe here is little, but what (in effect) he had ſayd before, and hath bin accordingly anſwered already; except it be ſome higher and fouler ſtreyns of portentuous revilings: to all which, the beſt anſwere is, Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος: The Lord rebuke thee.

I ſhall onely propound (and that with as much brevity as may be) ſome ſober and calme queſtions to him, about ſome particulars in theſe *pages*.

Firſt I would know, from what *Fountaine*, Mr. *W.* drank that draught of *Divinity*, that *Faith* in *Ieſus Chriſt*, whereby the *Scriptures* ſtill affirme a man to be *juſtified*. *Rom.* 5. 1. 2 &c. taken in a *proper ſenſe*, ſhould be a part of our obedience to the *Law*? *pag.* 18. Certainely, intire obedience to the whole *Law*, was required of *Adam* in the ſtate of *innocency*, but no man (I thinke the man of exceptions onely excepted, Mr. *W.* I meane) will affirme, that *Adam* in this condition, was bound to *beleeve* in *Ieſus Chriſt*, for his *juſtification*, the *Law* not being of *Faith* (as the Apoſtle affirmeth, *Gal.* 3. 12.)

Secondly I would know, where either *Wotton* or *Goodwin* teach, that wee are juſtified (meritoriouſly, or elſe the charge vaniſheth) by a worke of *obedience* to the Law? *Ibidem.* 2.

Thirdly, how Mr. *W.* proves, that the *righteouſnes imputed* to *Abraham* was a perfect conformity to the Law? *page* 19. 3.

Fourthly how it followeth, that *God* muſt needes erre lye, and judge *unrighteouſly*, if hee, *imputeth righteouſnes* to any man without *workes*? *ibidem.* 4.

Againe how Mr. *W.* proveth that the *imputation* of *faith* for *righteouſnes*, makes the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, and his perfect fulfilling the *Law*, a vaine and needleſſe thing? Mr. *G.* conceiveth, that it eſtabliſheth both the one and the other. *Ibidem.* 5.

6. Againe: how Mr. *W.* can bring it about either by *Scripture* or *reaſon*, that the making of *Chriſts ſatisfaction* ours, as truely as if we had fulfilled the *Law* in our perſons, ſhould bee a meanes whereby *God* is revealed to be infinitely *juſt*, *merciſull* and *wiſe*? Mr. *G.* conceiveth, that if *Chriſts ſatisfaction* were made ours upon no better termes, then as if wee had fulfilled the *Law* in our owne perſons, it would ſtand us in little ſtead for our *iuſtification*: becauſe he ſuppoſeth, that man having once ſinned and fallen, could never have beene *iuſtified* by the fulfilling of the *Law* in his owne perſon, though he had fulfilled and kept it as perfectly as *Chriſt* did, a thouſand times over. *page* 20.

7. Againe whether Mr. *W.* doth not thinke, that *God* did diſpenſe with his *iuſtice*, when he paſſed by the ſinner, and inflicted the puniſhment of death upon the innocent? or whether hee will call either the one, or the other, an act of iuſtice? Mr. *G.* conceiveth that *Gods iuſtice* led him directly to the *ſinner*, *to execute vengeance* upon him: and that it was his mercy that led him aſide from him that had deſerved *death*, to another that had not deſerved it. *Ibidem.*

8. Againe: what ſhould move Mr. *VV.* to thinke or ſay, that thoſe that hold *imputation* of *Faith* for *righteouſnes*, ſhould deny Communion with *Chriſt* in his *ſatisfaction*: when as Mr. *G.* ſtill affirmeth, that that *faith* which is *imputed* for *righteouſnes*, is ordained by *God* to bring men into Communion, and fellowſhip with *Chriſt* in his *ſatisfaction*: and by *vertue* of ſuch *ordination*, *iuſtifieth inſtrumentally*, or (which is the ſame) is *imputed* for *righteouſnes*? *page* 19.

9. Againe: how doth Mr. *VV.* prove, that the Authors of *Imputation* of *faith* for *righteouſnes*, deny the infinite *iuſtice* of *God* to ſtand in ſtrength, or to require ſuch a *ſatisfaction* as *Chriſt God* and *man* made? *page* 21. when as they conceive no poſſibility of ſuch *imputation*, but by vertue of ſuch *ſatisfaction*: neither can they imagine

gine any ſuch *faith*, as they conceive to bee *imputed* for *righteouſneſſe*, without ſuppoſing a *Mediatour*, *God* and *man*, on whom it ſhould reſt, and who gives it that very nature and being which it hath. It is true, they deny, that the *juſtice* of *God ſimply* and abſolutely required ſuch a *ſatisfaction* as *Chriſt*, *God* and *man* made: but upon *ſuppoſition*, that *God* would bring many ſonnes to *Glory*, and ſave that which was loſt, they deny it not. But their denyall, or not denyall in this kind, hath little dependance upon the point of *imputation*.

Again how doth it appeare, that the men under the laſh of Mr. *Ws.* tongue, hold, that *God* by his Soveraigne power, may doe and will things contrary to his *juſtice* (*p.* 22.) 10.

Againe: how doth it appeare, that to *count* or *accept* that for *righteouſnes*, (or unto *righteouſnes*) which is not *righteouſnes* (that is a legall *righteouſnes*) muſt needs be contrary to *Gods juſtice*: whereas Mr. *W.* himſelf holdeth, that *God* accepts *Chriſts righteouſnes* and *ſatisfaction*, for every mans perſonall *righteouſnes*, that *beleeveth*; which yet I preſume, himſelf will not ſay, is every mans perſonal *righteouſnes*, in deed and in truth: at leaſt not that perſonall *righteouſnes*, for, and inſtead of which it is (according to his mind) ſo accepted *p* 22. But of this enough, and enough before. 11.

Againe where Mr. *VV.* findes it, that either *VVotton* or *Goodwin*, deny *Chriſts righteouſnes*, to bee the *righteouſnes* of true *beleevers*, *page* 22. Indeed they deny it, *ſenſu VValkeriano*, that is, *Apocrypho*; to be the *righteouſnes* by which they are formally *juſtified* in the ſight of *God*: but they affirme it to bee that *righteouſnes*, by which, and by which alone, they are *juſtified meritoriouſly* in the ſight of *God*. But they affirme it to be that *righteouſneſſe* by which, and by which alone, they are *juſtified meritoriouſly* in the ſight of *God*. And this they conceive imports as full, as deepe, as intire a propriety in it, as that *Apocryphall* propriety which Mr. *W.* would (if he knew how) entitle them unto. 12.

Againe, where the men he wot's of, argue, that the *righteousneſſe* of one, cannot be ſufficient for all the *Elect*, (*pag.* 23.) whereas they maintaine, the *righteousneſſe* and *ſatisfaction*, of *Chriſt*, to be ſufficient, both for all the *Elect*, and *Non-elect* too, but with a *Scriptures* ſufficiencie too, not an *apocryphall*. That the ſame acts of obedience to the *Morall Law*, ſhould the *Letter*, and *formality* of them, make a *morall*, or *Legall righteouſneſſe*, that ſhould fit all men, and women, of all *Callings*, and *Conditions*, in the world, they hold it every whit, as ſenſeleſſe, and unreaſonable, as that the ſame garment ſhould fit all *Statures*, and *Proportions* of *bodyes*, or the ſame Shoe, all feet of all ſizes; And they conceive the *Scriptures* to be as far from affirming the one as the other. And yet they fully beleeve, that the *righteouſneſſe* and *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, taken together, in the *Spirit*, or *merit*, of them, are, as of abſolute neceſſity, ſo of abſolute ſufficiency, for the *juſtification* of a world of Sinners.

14. Againe, what colour, or appearance of *reaſon*, Mr. *VV.* can bring, that they ſhould overthrow the Doctrine of *Redemption*, and *Chriſts ſatisfaction*, who deny, that men may be properly ſayd to have *ſatisfied Gods juſtice* themſelves in *Chriſt*? *pag.* 23. Certainely, a difference about propriety of ſpeaking, doth not overthrow a fundamentall *Article* of *faith*. But Mr. *VV.* (Womanlike) *molliter iraſci non novit*, knowes not how to chide under *Hereſie* and *Blaſphemy*: well, for all this great wrath that is boyled up to ſuch a height in Mr. *VVs.* breſt, againſt me, I ſhall ſtill thinke it ſafer, both to thinke and ſay, that *Chriſt ſatisfied* the *juſtice* of *God* for me, then that I my ſelfe *ſatisfied* the *juſtice* of *God* for my ſelfe.

15. Againe, What monſtrouſneſſe of opinion it is, or what *contrariety* there is in it, either to common *ſenſe* or *reaſon*, to deny any *formall legall righteouſnes*, in *Juſtification*: *juſtification*, conſiſting onely in remiſſion of ſinnes,

(as

(as both *Scriptures*, and *Calvin*, and many a worthy Divine more with him, joyntly testifie) *pag.* 23. as I have proved at large, elsewhere.

Againe, What those expresse words are, *Rom* 5.19. and 8. 4. and 10. 4. wherein the Apostle should affirme, that the *faithfull* are *constituted* and made formally *righteous*, by the obedience of *Christ communicated*, and *imputed* unto them, *pag* 24. I cannot in all those *Scriptures* find so much as one EXPRESSE word, either of the *communication*, much lesse of the *imputation* of *Christs righteousnesse* to the *faithfull*, least of all, of their being made *formally righteous* by such *imputation*. And yet if Mr. *VV.* could be perswaded to use a mans words kindly, I would grant also, that we are *justified* even *formally* too, by the *communication* of *Christs righteousnesse*, and *satisfaction*, to us, *viz.* In as much as by such *communication* we obtaine remission of sinnes, which is our *formall justification*. Therefore we do not deny a *formall righteousnesse* in *justification* (as Mr. *VV.* ignorantly, or falsely, which he will, chargeth us) but onely a *legall*, *formall*, *righteousnes*. 16.

Againe, where he finds it to be any branch of the *Pelagian Heresie*, to deny that *Adams posterity*, are made *formally* sinners, with *Adams* sinne *imputed* to them in the *Letter*, and *formality* of it? *pag.* 24. 17.

Againe, Who they are that deny, that Infants, dying before they commit actuall sinne, are punished by death, because they are guilty of *Adams* sinne; or affirmeth, that *God* out of his *justice* destroyeth innocent *Babes*? *pag* 24. But Mr. *VV.* may please to understand (if he be not too much inamourd upon the loveless face of confusion) that it is one thing to have the guilt of *Adams* sinne derived upon his *posterity*, another thing to have the act of his sinne (in the *Letter*, and *formality* of it) *imputed* to his *posterity*, so that for such *imputation*, they should all be destroyed. I do not think the former was ever denyed, either by *VVotton*, or *Goodwin*. Neither 18.

do I thinke the latter will ever be proved by Mr. *VV.* And therefore ridiculous is that qualification, which he seekes to apply to ease the destruction of innocent *Babes* (as he calls them) in affirming, that by the *word* and *Law* of *God* they were not to die for the sinnes of their *Parents*, unlesse they be partakers with them, either by *communion*, and *imputation*, or by *imitation*, and *approbation*, (as if *imitation*, and *approbation*, were no *communion* with them in their sinnes, being indeed, the greatest, and deepest of all) or as if the destruction of these *Babes*, were at all lightned, or eased, because *God* is pleased to *impute* their *Parents* sinnes unto them: or as if the *iustice of God* in the destruction of such *Babes*, were ever the more *cleared*, or *iustified*, by Mr. *VVs. imputation* of the acts of the *Parents* sinne, then by the charging of the *guilt*, or *demerit*, of such sinnes upon them: especially considering, that howsoever the act of *God*, involving *Adams posterity* in the guilt of his sinne, or exposing them to condemnation for it, was a *righteous* and *iust* act in him; that is, was nothing but what he might *lawfully*, and *iustly* doe: yet was it no act of his *iustice*, whereunto he was necessitated, but an act of his *will* and *free pleasure*: as Dr. *Twist*, and other *Divines* teach, and acknowledge. For the charg he putsuponus of the Children of *Korah*, be shall do well to name who have made that use of them, he speakes of, and let them answere for them.

19. Againe, How they that deny the *imputation* of *Christs righteousnes*, (*viz.* In the *Letter*, and *formality* of it) to *beleevers*, do hereby give or ascribe as much *iustificatiō* by it to *Infidels*, and *impenitent Reprobates*, as to *beleevers* themselves? (*pag.* 25.) when as they so expresselv affirme and maintaine, that *Faith* is the onely meanes ordained by *God*, to bring men into *communion* with *Christ*, and to give them part in that great benefit of *Redemption*, which was purchased for the world by him.

Againe,

Againe, how Mr. *W.* can poſſibly avoyd the ſame abſurdity himſelfe, which he falſly charg'd his adverſaries with, in the former quere *viz.* the bringing in of *Infidels*, as well as *Beleevers*, for *iuſtification*, by *Chriſt*, when-as he affirmeth the new *Covenant* by *Chriſt*, to be no waies conditionall, not *faith* itſelfe, to be any condition of the *Covenant*, to be performed on our part, for our *iuſtification*, and *ſalvation*. In which conceit (certainly) he is, A perſe A. and hath no man either at his *right hand* or at his *left*, to ſtand by him, or releive him therein. 20.

Againe (once more) how Mr. *W.* can prove it to be a miſtake (I ſhall be content to abate and eaſe him of the fag end of the taſque, the groſſeneſſe, and abſurdity, of it) to hold or ſay, that *iuſtification* and *life*. are promiſed, upon condition of *beleeving*, *pag.* 25. Either they are promiſed abſolutely, and without all *condition*, or they are promiſed upon ſome other *condition*, beſides *beleeving*, or they are promiſed upon the condition of *beleeving*; or laſtly, they are not promiſed at all. If they be abſolutely and without all condition what doth *faith* or *beleeving*, conduce to the obtaining them? Mr. *VVs.* diſtinction, betweene the condition of obtaining a promiſe and the meanes or way of obtaining a promiſe, puts me in mind of the *Phyſitians* wife, in Biſhop *Iewell* who comprimiſ'd a ſolemne difference betweene her and, ſome of her neighbours women, concerning *pepper*, ſhe (it ſeemes) affirming it to bee cold, they oppoſing her, by the hot taſt it hath in the mouth but ſhe under the protection of this diſtinction, that though it were hot in working, yet it might bee cold in *operation*, came off with *Honour*, and amuſing her oppoſers with her profound learning and ſubtilty, carried the cauſe with a ſtrong hand. If Mr. *W.* meets onely with ſuch *Readers*, as ſhe did *oppoſers*, his diſtinction betweene the condition, and the meanes of obtaining a promiſe, may worke wonnders and make him ſeeme ſomething. But in denying *faith* to bethe 21.

condition

condition of the *Goſpell* or new *Covenant*; hee doth not onely hang out the *flag* of *deſyance* againſt *Wotton*, and *Goodwin*, but ſwims againſt the ſtreame of the moſt confeſſedly *Orthodox Divines* of our owne *Church*, yea and oppoſeth thoſe that take part with him in this controverſie; and are the ableſt maintainers of his *Faith* therein. For Biſhop *Downeham* expreſſely affirmeth, the condition whereon the *Goſpell* promiſeth *juſtification*, to be *Faith* in *Chriſt*, as the condition of the *Law*, to bee our owne perfect and perſonall *obedience*: And builds this condition of the *Goſpell*, upon thoſe very *Scriptures*, which Mr. *W.* hath rejected. For (ſaith he) the *Goſpell* ſaith, *If thou beleeve in Chriſt, thou art juſtified, and ſhalt be ſaved.* (*Rom.* 10. 5.) the *Law*, *If thou doſt theſe things thou ſhalt live thereby.* B. *Downham:* in his Doctrine of *Chriſtian* Liberty, on *Iohn* 8. 36. *page* 44. By which it appeares, that hee makes *Faith* the condition of the *Goſpell*, in the ſame manner, and upon the ſame termes, that *workes*, or perfect *obedience*, was of the *Law*. And *Calvin* on *Rom.* 10. 8. to the ſame purpoſe: *Ex hâc diſtinctionis notâ &c.* that is, from this diſtinction we gather, that as the *Law* requires *workes*, ſo the *Goſpell* requires nothing, but that men bring *Faith* to receive the *grace* of *God*. That great light of our *Church*, Mr. *Perkins*, could not diſcerne the ſubtilty of Mr. *Ws.* diſtinction neither, but without ſcruple, affirmes *Faith* to be the condition of this *Covenant*. In the *Covenant* of *grace* (ſaith hee) two things muſt be conſidered: the ſubſtance, and the condition *&c.* the condition is, that wee for our parts, are by *Faith* to receive the foreſaid *benefits* (*Reform. Cath: of iuſtific. Differ.* 2.) So Mr. *Fox*, *Conditio quâ propriè inſtificamur &c.* that is, the *condition* whereby wee are properly *iuſtified*, is this, that wee *beleeve* in *Chriſt*: In his treatiſe of *Chriſt* freely *iuſtifying*. Againe (in the ſame treatiſe) the *promiſe* of *ſalvation* by *Chriſt*, belongs but unto ſome, and that under a certaine *condition*: So

that

that he never conceited that the leaſt *preiudice* could ariſe to the freeneſſe of *Gods grace* in the *Covenant* of the *Goſpell*, by making *Faith* the *condition* of it. I might heap up Teſtimonies (in this kind) without end, If I thought any man were of Mr. *VVs. opinion* in this point, but himſelfe. Nay I am certaine that himſelfe is not of his owne *opinion*: becauſe immediately after he had rejected *Faith*, with great *indignation*, from being any *condition* of the *Goſpell*, hee writeth thus: In all which and the like places, there is no *condition* of the *Covenant* propounded, but onely the meanes and the way to receive bleſſing, or the quality and *condition*, by which men are made capable *&c.* As faire and goodly a contradiction, as a man ſhall meet withall in a ſommers day, or ſeven yeares reading: there is no *condition*, but onely a *condition*. O acuteneſſe! *quibus Cœlo te laudibus æquem!* I ſee many other things in this limb of his diſcourſe, that deſerve the Cenſors rod: but *Non ego ſi centum penas &c.*

Having already proved the *Socinian* and *Arminian opinion*, to be moſt falſe *&c.* I proceed to diſcover the weakneſſe and abſurdity of Mr. *Goodwins Arguments* in the ſecond chapter of his *Socinian* diſcourſe *&c.* Mr. *W.* p. 26.

They that will *beleeve* Mr. *VV.* may; but otherwiſe (ſetting his owne ſayings aſide, as I am conſtrained to doe) he hath left his *Reader* at full liberty to doubt and queſtion, whether he hath ſo much as touch'd either the *Socinian* or *Arminian opinion* (touching the point in hand) in all his diſcourſe hithe to; becauſe he hath not proved ſo much as any one word, of all thoſe things wherewith he hath charged them, either out of any of their owne writings, or from the teſtimony of any approved *Author* againſt them, yea they that will pleaſe to peruſe, and conſider what hath bin already ſaid in this Reply, will eaſily conceive that Mr. *VV.* doubtleſſe was in the midſt of *Samaria*, when hee ſuppoſed himſelfe to have beene in *Dothan*, (at leaſt would

have perſwaded his *Reader*, that there he was.)

Well: But though he hath miſcarried and misbehaved himſelfe in the *front*, he will now play the man in the *reere*, and gather up the credit and *reputation* hee hath ſcattered. Now he hath to deale with *Goodwin* alone, he will be revenged on him, he and his *Socinian* diſcourſe ſhall pay for all. Whether Mr. *W.* hath an ill tongue, in his head, or no, I know not: but ſure I am, that the diſcourſe he ſpeakes of, was not *Socinian*, till he cal'd it ſo: neither was ſo much as one thrid of that ſpinning in all the whole piece. But I hope Mr. *Ws.* tongue from henceforth, will be no ſlander. However, the ſecond chapter of this diſcourſe, *Socinian* or not *Socinian*, the *Lion* hath gotten betweene his teeth, and threatens to teare it into a thouſand pieces. And firſt of all, *Sampſon*-like, he rouſeth and ſhakes himſelfe, and ſets himſelfe cheerefully to ſtand againſt the truth.

How he meanes to proceed, he ſufficiently declares in his beginning, *viz.* by the rule and method of *malice*, and *frowardneſſe*. If the firſt fruites bee ſowre and uncleane, ſo is the whole lump like to bee alſo. What I ſpeake indefinitely, and in the generall, concerning the hard meaſure that is oft-times meaſured out by men to thoſe that ſpeake the truth from *God* unto them, hee miſuſeth and perverts, as if I aſſum'd all to my ſelfe, and would leave nothing for him.

But the rude multitude of my *Diſciples* are a great offence unto him, by proclaiming mee to bee the great light of the *Church &c.* (Who Mr. *W.* meanes by my rude *diſciples*, I know not: neither (I beleeve) doth he know himſelfe. If I knew them, I would ſend them to him to learne better manners, and to be taught more *elegant* behaviour. But they proclaime mee the great light of *Gods Church*. Surely this was whil'ſt Mr. *W.* ſlept: theſe rude fellowes got in by the dore of his noſtrills, and ſo clamber'd up into his *Crowne*, and there playd their prankes, and made that *ſacrilegi-*

ous

our proclamation. But more ſoberly: ſuppoſe theſe fellowes indeed ſpake ſuch wordes of me, what will Mr. *W.* give me, and I will pull off the fooles bable from my head, and he ſhall have it to ſet on his: if he longs, his longing ſhall not coſt him much: he ſhall have it at a very low rate. I will entreat my *diſciples* to proclaime him, this great light *&c.* But the multitude of my *diſciples* ſtick in his ſtomack too. Surely the *ſhadowes* of the *Mountaines* ſeeme men to him: or elſe he lookes through the multiplying glaſſe of envy. And yet I conceive the number of the men hee meanes, may be ſomewhat encreaſed, by his owne *unreaſonable, unChriſtian, and furious proceedings* againſt me. An unmercifull enemy many times begets friends.

But how ſhall I doe? he wounds mee on the heele, and takes me tardy with a contradiction. Well: I ſee it is no halting before a cripple. A man cannot counterfeit a contradiction, but Mr. *W.* a man ſo much overſeene in contradictions, will find it out. But *Contradiction*, where art thou? and what is thy name? Here Sir, and my Name is,

The Holy Ghoſt is the beſt Iudge for determining controverſies:

The Holy Ghoſt leaves his meaning (in many things) to be debated by men.

Thou a *Contradiction*? who made thee a *Contradiction*? Mr. *W.* Sir. But how could he poſſibly make thee a *Contradiction*? by a wrench that he hath, whereby he can turne *light* into *darknes*, and *truth* into *errour*, and the *honour* of *God* into *blaſphemy*, and ſtreight things into crooked, and the faireſt conſiſtencies into *contradictions*. Well, goe thy wayes: thou haſt fallen into bad hands: but doe but pray men to looke well upon thee, and the *charme* will be diſſolved, and thy native ſhape ſhall returne unto thee: thou ſhalt be no longer a *contradiction*.

Immediately after, he ſprings a new game, and in

that *phrase* used by me, stamped with a rationall authority, he discovers the *Arminian Heresie*, and falls foule upon *right reason*. Indeed it is no strange thing, for an angry man to fall out with *right reason*, because they are seldome friends.

Ὡς οὐκ ἐστὶ λέουσι, καὶ ἀνδράσιν ὅρκια πιστά:
Ἀλλὰ κακὰ φρονέουσι διαμπερὲς ἀλλήλοισι. that is,

'Twixt Men, and Lions, no league firme will stand,
But to destroy each other still they band.

But I confesse Mr. *W.* may bee the better borne with, if hee calls for club-Law against *right Reason*, and would by all meanes have it knock'd downe, because it is still an enemy to him, and still crosseth and opposeth and contradicteth him in his *enterprises*. And yet presently after he had cried out against me for an *Arminian Heretick* in the point of *Right Reason*, he makes a second out-crie upon mee, for running away, from *right reason*, in the whole progresse of my *disputation*. Sure the man is not to be dealt with, or pacified, neither with right reason nor without it; but is as full of *contradictions* in his *Moralls*, as in his *intellectualls*, that the one might not laugh at the other. But it stands him in hand in the businesse hee is now about to turne *Arminian Heretick* himselfe (if that be an *Arminian Heresie* to make use of *Reason* in the Interpretation of *Scripture*) because the letter of the *Scripture* hee is to deale with, still with-stands him in the face, and will not come neere the *opinion* hee maintaines, except it be brought over by a strong hand of *reason* and discourse. And whereas he complaines of *scandalousnes* in me to professe excellent things of my selfe, *&c.* but is not able to bring one the least word, or tittle out of all my discourse sounding that way: I am sure it is 7. times more scandalous in him, to deliver such staring

and

and broadfac'd *untruthes*. All that I ſpeake of my ſelf, is rather by way of diſparagement, and with more *modeſty* then he (it ſeemes) was able to beare: and therefore gets him up into *God's* Throne, and there playes *Sathans* part, *judging* the mindes and intentions of men, contrary to their doings. *Iob* 1. But I perceive what meat Mr. *W.* loves: hee is loath there ſhould bee a *Feaſt* of excellent things, whereunto he is not invited: Well: If I have treſpaſſed againſt his appetite, here, I will make him this promiſe (for amends) that the next time I ſpeake ſuch excellent things of the undeſerving, he ſhall be the man.

His firſt Argument &c. In his Anſwere, to that which he calls my firſt *argument*, he preſently ſets his *Ignorance* and mine together by the eares, and raiſeth a fearefull duſt and *combuſtion* betweene them. Let his be the Conqueror, and mine the *Graſ-hopper*. Firſt he arraignes me at the barre of his ſuppoſed *learning*, for thoſe heinous crimes of *Ignorance* in *Rhetorick* and *Logick*: Secondly for ſhewing my ſelfe a bold lying *Sophiſter*, which hang together, as the teſtimonies of thoſe falſe witneſſes, that came to give in *evidence* againſt *Chriſt*, *Mar.* 14. 59. *Ignorance* in *Logick* deſtroyes *Sophiſtrie*, as *ignorance* in the *Scriptures* doth *Divinity*. Well: his charge (you ſee) is ſore: but his proofes as *ridiculous* and contemptible. Hee demonſtrates my *ignorance* in *Rhetorick*, thus: becauſe it is counted an excellent *ornament* of *ſpeech*, to continue a *trope &c.* which is, as if I ſhould prove Mr. *W.* to be *ignorant* in *Divinity*, becauſe in the beginning *God* made *heaven* and *earth*. If Mr. *W.* ſhould deny this, the proofe were ſomewhat to the purpoſe: but not denying it, it is no proofe at all againſt him, but that poſſibly he may be a *learned Divine* notwithſtanding. Mr. *W.* pag. 30.

My *ignorance* in *Logick*, he proves from the unqueſtionable *profuſidity* of his own inſight into that *Science*, which appeares in this, that he is able to tell us, that in *Logick* he

„ is counted a bould lying *Sophiſter*, who holds, that a „ *Syllogiſme*; a true and perfect *Argument*, hath a *pro-* „ *poſition*, which is manifeſtly *falſe*. I confeſſe I do not remember, that ever I met with this golden rule to meaſure a *bold lying Sophiſter by*, ſo punctually in any *Logique*, or *Logician* I have read: and though I eaſily grant Mr. *VVs.* reading to have out-compaſſed mine, yet I beleeve, that neither hath he met with this rule in all his ſphere of reading; but we have it here new out of the mint of his owne braine, the fire is not yet out of it, *Logicians* are wont to ſpeake with reaſon, and ſobriety, and not to cal their *Brethren, bold lying Sophiſters*: the thrid is too courſe ever to have bin ſpun unpon their Wheele; well, but let us grant this profound *axiome* to be true: What is the truth thereof to evince my ignorance in *Logique* more then my knowledge that twiſe two make foure, is to prove Mr. *W.* ignorant in *Arithmetique*?

But leaving theſe *collaterall impertinences*, which (I conceive) are but the *crude*, and *indigeſted ebullitions* of his unnaturall heate and paſſion, deſerving rather pittie then Anſwer) let us (with what brevitie is poſſible) ſee what weight and ſubſtance there is in what he oppoſeth here againſt me. I argue the *imputing* of *faith* for *righteouſneſſe* in a *proper ſenſe* (that is, in the very ſame *ſenſe*, that himſelfe hath formerly given, and approved againe, and againe, in this his diſcourſe, as hath bin already obſerved from hence, becauſe the *phraſe* is ſo often uſed in this *Chap.* without any alteration or exchange; and affirme withall, that the *imputation* of *Chriſts righteouſneſſe* for our *righteouſnes* (in the *ſenſe* rejected in my former *Chapter*, and which Mr. *W.* muſt maintaine, or elſe I cannot count him an adverſarie in the point in queſtion) hath not the leaſt reliefe, either from ſound of wordes, or ſight of *Letter* in the *Scriptures*.

To this Mr. *W.* anſwers, that *Ier.* 26. the *Lord* is ſayd to repent 3 ſeverall times, and that this ſpeech is not proper &c. and that *Gal.* 3. the word *Faith* is uſed 10. times

times in an unproper *ſenſe*, &c. and hence inferres, that the frequent, and conſtant uſe of a *phraſe*, doth not prove a proper acception of it &c. Which concluſion indefinitly taken, and in the generall, is unqueſtionably true: and his inſtances, are currant proofs hereof. I will deny nothing that he ſpeakes with *reaſon*, but freely aſſent to him, and commend him: becauſe I would encourage him to ſpeake more upon ſuch terms.

But yet he might have pleaſed here to have conſidered, that rule which *Auſtine* long ſince gave, and *Divines* generally have approved from him; that a *literall*, and *proper ſenſe* in *Scripture*, is ſtill to be preferr'd, where there is no neceſſity of rejecting it, or *ſubſtituting* a *tropicall*, or *improper* in the ſtead. And except this rule be admitted as unqueſtionable, the cleereſt, and moſt expreſſe truths in *Scripture*, will ſtill be *obnoxious* to *diſpute*, and *controverſie*, and may be toſſed up and downe, by the wills, and wits of men. Now this rule wholly evacuates the ſtrength of his anſwere: becauſe in thoſe *Scriptures* produced by him, there is an apparent neceſſity of having recourſe to an *improper ſignification* of the words, becauſe the *litterall*, and *proper*, imports a manifeſt contradiction, to common *ſenſe* and *reaſon*; as is ſufficiently evident to him that ſhal but a little conſider thoſe and the like *Scriptures*. And in ſuch a caſe as this, where there is no danger or feare, that the *literall ſenſe* ſhould be taken, becauſe the very principles of *reaſon*, are ready to cry out againſt it: the holy *Pen-men* of *Scripture*, may uſe a *metaphoricall expreſſion*, 10 times together, and twenty times after that; the frequency of the *repetition*, will never be any *proofe*, or *argument*, of a *proper*, or *literall ſignification*. But in the *Scripture* and *phraſe controverted* betweene Mr. *VV*. and me, the caſe is far otherwiſe: the *literall*, and *proper ſenſe*, may here be taken, no rule of *reaſon*, (no nor of *Religion* neither, as hath bin proved both here, and elſewhere) gainſaying it, (at leaſt not manifeſtly, nor notoriouſly contradicting it)

and

and therefore the frequent, and constant use of such a *phrase*, is a strong inducement (at least) that the *literall* and *proper sense* is here to be imbraced.

Whereas (towards the close of this answere) he breakes out againe, and gives me a new Livery of the „ same Cloath, with the former, calling me *bold lying* „ *Sophister*, for affirming most *falsly* and *impudently*, that which he would not have to be affirmed upon this occasion, though he be not able to disprove it (nor so much as attempts to do it) because it little concernes the present question. I will gratifie his infirmity so far, as to passe it over without any further censure.

The second Argument Couched under the other, &c.

How kind and courteous an adversary have I met withall, who rather then I shall want *Arguments* to oppose him, will furnish me, at his own cost and charge, yea and (that which is yet more) with such *Arguments* that are too hard for himselfe, and which all his learning is not able to overthrow. As for example, out of my words, wherein I had no thoughts of any New *Argument*, distinct from the former, Mr. *VV.* raiseth this *Syllogisme.*

That which hath not the least releefe, either from sound of words, or sight of Letter in the Scriptures, is an untruth, and meere fiction.

The imputation of Christs righteousnesse (in the sense questioned) hath not the least releefe either from the one, or the other. Ergo.

Mr. *W.* having *coniur'd* up this *Spirit*, to shew his art, and to make himselfe merry withall, presently attempts

attempts to *conjure* him downe againe. But his condition in this skirmish, is as sad as that of the Vagabond *Exorcists*, *Act.* 19. who would needs be medling with, and *adjuring* the Spirit in one that was possessed, but the Spirit was sturdy and would not obey, but ran upon the adjurers, and overcame them and prevailed against them, so that they fled naked and wounded. *v.* 16. So Mr. *VV.* heaving at the *Minor proposition*, of this his owne *Syllogisme*, receives a wound in his reputation, and so leaves it, the *proposition* remaining as strong, and as unshaken, as before hee lift up his weapon against it. For going about to prove that the *imputation* of *Christs righteousnes* (in his sence) hath testimony from the expresse words and letter of *Scripture*, hee onely produceth the 4. and 11. *verses* of this 4. *Chap.* to the *Romans*, both which are as silent concerning any *imputation* of *Christ's righteousnes*, as Mr. *VV.* (on the other side) is full of words. And it hath beene already shewed and proved in this reply, that the *phrase* of *imputing righteousnes* in these two places, onely notes *God's* free *justification* of men, or his accepting of them as *righteous*, without *workes*.

In answere to my second Argument (which he hath made the third by his munificent multiplication) he either findeth (or maketh) *a heape of lies mixt with contradictions* (and that in one *proposition* onely) I see my *Antagonist* is two to one better at making lies, and *contradictions* then at *judging* of them, or finding them out. A man may easily deceive him with a very slender appearance of a *contradiction*: but those which himselfe makes are very reall and *substantiall* and can deceive no man (as we have given good proofe in particular *instances*, out of this his *Answere*, not a few.) But who would thinke that one poore *proposition*, could bee so mischievously bent, as to have no lesse *then a heape of lies mixt with contradictions*, in the belly of it? I know not how many lies goe to Mr. *VVs.* heape: I hope he doth not meane *Mr. VV. page* 31.

any great heape: for then no man will be able to *beleeve* him. But I mervaile why he addes, mixt with *contradictions*. I cannot yet fathome his intent and *meaning* in this, whether he makes this *addition* by way of any *diminution*, or of further aggravation of that charge, a heape of *lies*. I cannot be so *uncharitable* in my thoughts to Mr. *Ws.* passion, as that that should betray him, or suffer him to speake any thing by way of *favour* or *mitigation* of any thing, that hee can come by, either by *booke* or by *crooke*, to lay to my charge: and how on the other hand to *interpret it*, by way of deepening or further aggravating the charge, I know not. Because, a *heape of lies alone*, without any *mixture* of *contradictions*, is much worse, then where there is an inlaying of *contradictions* with it, there being no *contradiction*, but the one halfe of it is ever *truth*. But I further appeare in Mr. *Ws.* eyes, *like a mad or a drunken man:* which certainly is as perfect a *signe*, that his eyesight is not good, as the seeing of men walking like *trees*, was of the imperfection of his *eyes*, who was not yet recovered of his *blindnesse*, *Mar.* 8.

But let us see a little what the angry *man* aileth, and pick the *thorne* out of his finger (if wee can) which makes him rage and take on as if hee were wild. If the *heape* of *lies* mixt with *contradictions* be removed from before his dore, I hope his neighbours shall live in *peace* by him. Wee will carrie it cleane away by little and little.

The top of this *heap* (which must first be taken away) is a *contradiction*, which (for want of better sight,) hee descrieth in these wordes of *mine*: The *Scope* of the *Apostle* is to put men by the *false way* of *justification*, which lies through *workes*, and to discover the *true way*, by informing them what they must doe, and performe for *justification*. Here because I affirme, the *way* of *justification* by *workes* to be the *false way*, a *way* wherein men cannot be *justified*, and yet suppose that men must

doe

doe ſomewhat, before they bee *iuſtified*, (or for their *iuſtification*) he triumphingly inſults over me, as a *drunken* and *mad man*, for contradicting my ſelfe, as if he that doth any thing at all towards his *iuſtification*, muſt needs ſeeke to be *iuſtified* by *workes*. I hope, if *Ieſus Chriſt* himſelfe ſpeake as I doe in this caſe, Mr. *W.* will preſently diſcharge me of this *contradiction*, for feare of worſe matters. I thinke hee will not deny, but that *faith*, or *beleeving* in *Chriſt*, is neceſſary to *iuſtification* (or elſe he will *iuſtifie* the *Infidells*, and impenitent *Reprobates* hee ſpake of, as well as the *faithfull*) and certaine I am, that *Chriſt* calls this *faith*, or *beleeving* in him, a *worke*: This is the *worke* of *God* (ſaith hee to the *Iewes*, *Ioh.* 6. 29.) that yee *beleeve* in him, whom he hath ſent: And when *Paul* exhorts the *Philippians*, *to worke out their ſalvation with feare and trembling*, he doth not exclude their *faith*, or *beleeving* in *Chriſt*. So our beſt and moſt *Orthodox Diuines*, ſpeak without ſcruple, terming that *beleeving* by which wee are *iuſtified*, the doing of ſomething. *Quid eximfecit Abraham, quod imputaretur ad juſtitiam, niſi quod credidit Deo? Muſculus* in *Gal.* 3. 6. that is, what did *Abraham*, that ſhould be *imputed* for *righteouſnes*, but onely *beleeve God*. So Mr. *Perkins Reform. Cathol.* concerning *juſtification*. The meaning is (ſaith hee) that nothing within man, and nothing that man can doe, either by *nature* or by *grace*, concurreth to the act of *iuſtification* before *God*, as any cauſe thereof, either *efficient*, *materiall*, *formall*, or *finall*, but onely *faith*. And I would faine know of Mr. *W.* whether when he *beleeveth*, he doth ſomething or nothing: or when hee *beleeveth*, whether he *beleeveth* not for *iuſtification*, or that he may bee *iuſtified*. The *Apoſtles* themſelves *beleeved* for ſuch an end, and purpoſe *Gal.* 2. 16. *We have beleeved in Ieſus Chriſt, that wee might be iuſtified by the faith of Chriſt*, ſurely if they might have beene *juſtified* without doing any thing at all, they might have let

this *beleeving* in *Christ* alone: which I hope Mr. *W.* himselfe doth not, for feare of seeking *justification* by *workes*. *Yea*, doth hee not in this very place, in as expresse termes (as usually he speaketh) affirme, and avoneh the very same *doing* or *worke* as necessary to *justification*, for which he rates mee with that *prodigious* „ *indignation*? Hee affirmes, that the *Apostles* whole „ *scope* is bent against *justification*, by *workes* of our „ own, and to shew that all which we are to look to, is to „ *receive* that, which is freely given &c. *Questionlesse*, *receiving*, is the doing of somewhat, and indeed one and the selfe same *work*, with *beleeving*. See *Iohn* 1. 11. 12 &c. besides many other *Scriptures*. And I marvaile from what brest he suck'd that same ἀλογων γάλα, to call every thing that is done by us, if it bee „ *just* and *lawfull*, a *worke* of the *Law*, (meaning the morall *Law*.) Surely to serve, *worship*, and *beleeve* in *Iesus Christ*, as *Mediatour*, are *just* and *lawfull*, yet no *works* of the morall *Law*, nor was *Adam* in his *innocency* bound unto them. And if Mr. *W.* had understood what the *Scripture* meanes, by *workes*, in *opposition* to *grace*, in the businesse of *justification*, he would not have condemned an innocent and cleere passage of the foule *crime* of a *contradiction*. By *workes* (in this case) is not meant, whatsoever may in any respect be said to bee done by a man himselfe, as if the freenesse of *Gods grace* in *justification*, should any wayes suffer, or be destroyed, if any thing should upon any consideration, be required of him in *reference* to his *justification*: neither Mr. *W.* nor all the abettors he hath under *Heaven*, will ever be able to prove this: but by *workes*, (opposed to *grace*, in *justification*) is meant the *merit* of *workes*, or whatsoever is done, or attempted to be done by men themselves, with an *opinion* or intent of deserving *justification* thereby. Nay the *truth* is, that the *worke* of *beleeving*, (as our *Saviour* calleth it) is so farre, from carrying any *opposition* in it to the freenesse of *Gods grace* in *justification*, that

that it is purposely required of men (and it onely) by him, that the freenesse of his *grace* in their *justification* might be established. Therefore it is by *Faith*, that it might be by *grace*, *Rom.* 4. 16. and *cap.* 5. 2. *We are said to have accesse or admittance into the grace of justification, by or through Faith.* But for the perfect and intire consistence of the *worke* of *faith*, with the freenesse of *Gods grace* in the *justification* of a *sinner*, consider those and such like *Scriptures* at leysure, *Rom.* 3. 24. 25. *Eph.* 2. 8. *&c.*

Well, the Heape of *lies* mixt with *contradictions*, is (I hope) well lessened by this time: the plurall number in charge, prooves but the *singular* in proofe, and that just nothing: hee talk'd of *contradictions*, as of many: but findes but one, and that one made of as faire a consistency of *speech*, as the *Scripture* it selfe useth.

„ But besides the *contradictions*, and other *absurdities* „ and *untruths* (*observe*, hee speakes more mannerly „ then hee did: is there not hope hee will mend?) hee „ findes these grosse *errours &c.* Wee are come now towards the bottome of the heap, where (it seemes) the grossest and thickest of the *lies* are setled. The first is, that I say, that *God* doth not require of us the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, *&c.* this hee requires of *Christ* himselfe. Before he comes to shew the grossenes of this *errour*, hee himselfe drops two grosse *errours* (indeed) by the *way*, *viz.* That *God* requires nothing of us for our *justification*, whenas it is notoriously knowne, that he threatens damnation, except we *beleeve*; and to credit his saying, he cites, *Rom.* 3. 24. whereas the *verse* immediately following, quite overthrowes it, wherein the condition of *faith* is expresly mentioned. Hee drops yet againe a second *errour* (more grosse then the „ former) saying, that *Faith* is a *qualification* to us, for „ the receiving, applying, and enjoying *Christs righ-* „ *teousnes*: that is, *Faith* is a *qualification* to us for *be-*

leeving: for what is the *receiving*, *applying*, and *enioying* the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, but *beleeved* (as was before observed.) beleeving

But with these two *errors* dropping from him it seemes his memory dropped also, for by this time he hath forgot his *enterprize*, and instead of proving what I had said, „ a grosse *error*, he onely complaines of it, as a *harsh* „ *unsavoury* and *absurd phrase*. And to *justifie* his com- „ plaint, he tell us, that to say *God* requires the *righ-* of us „ *teousnes* of *Christ*, not for our *justification*, but of „ *Christ* himselfe, implies, that *Christ* had need of *in-* „ *stification*, and was bound to fulfill the *righteousnes* of „ the *Law* for himselfe: which favours of the *Socinian* „ and *Samosatenian heresie*, and denyes *Christs God-* „ *head*, with much more (as the manner of the man „ is)

Spectatum admissi risum teneatis amici?

Is not this a solid and demonstrative proofe, of the *harshnesse* and *unsavournesse* of this saying, *God* requires not of us the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, *&c.* Hee that can make these *premisses* and *Conclusion* hang, may well set up the trade of *gluing Oyster-shells*, and undertake to make the yron and the clay in *Nebuchadnezzars* Image, mix and worke together. He that saith, that *God* doth not require of us the *righteousnes* of *Christ* for our *in-* *stification*, doth not so much as in colour or shew, affirme, that he therefore requires it of him, for his owne *justification:* onely it seemes to imply, that hee required it of him for our *justification:* which (I conceive) is no *harsh* or *unsavoury*, but a *proposition* well pleasing to Mr. *W.* himselfe.

But setting aside the irrelativeneſſe and impertinency of what he affirmeth here, to what hee had in hand to proove, I could (I conceive) put some *queries* to him, that would a little trouble him, to make good the *truth* thereof in a *positive* way. As

First

First, how he can prove, that *Christ* had no need of *iustification*? Surely *Christ* was a *iustified*, or *righteous* person, in the sight of *God*. This *iustification* was not *superfluous*, or no wayes usefull to him. And whatsoever is not *superfluous*, we men of the lower forme of *learning* and understanding, *judge* to bee some wayes needfull.

Secondly how he would prove, that *Christ* was not bound to fulfill the *righteousnes* of the *Law* for himself? Certaine I am, that some *Divines* of our owne Church, and *Nation*, no whit inferiour to Mr. *W.* himselfe, either for *choyceneſſe* of *learning* or soundneſſe of *iudgement*, (and yet neither *Wotton*, nor *Goodwin*, nor any of their *Disciples*) have written otherwise: *Christ* (saith Mr. *Deering* in his second *Lect* on the *Heb.*) by the spirit, still fill'd his *manhood* more and more with *grace*, till the fulneſſe of all *righteousnes* was within him, that so his manhood might inherit *salvation*, according to the *promise*, *doe this and live*. But hitherto as he is *righteous*, so hee is *righteous* for *himselfe*, and onely that man is yet blessed which was *conceived* by the *Holy Ghost &c.*

And he that holds, that *Christ* as *man*, was not bound to fulfill the *righteousnes* of the *Law* for himselfe, dureing his continuance on Earth in the *flesh*, must (if hee will be true to his *principles*) hold with all, that *Christ* as *man* had a liberty, or *dispensation* from his *God-head*, to transgresse in respect of himselfe: and that this *dispensation* could not take place, or bee put in *execution*, onely because of that *worke* of *Redemption*, which he had undertaken. It may be this is no such *Camell*, but Mr. *VV.* can swallow, without straying. But I hope he will not be offended, if they that stand charged with so many *Hereſies* and *blaſphemies* already, bee unwilling to charge themselves yet further with this also.

Thirdly I would put him upon this, to prove such an absolute *inconſiſtency*, or *diametrall oppoſition*, as he seemes

to

to imagine; betweene *Christs* fulfilling the *Law* for himselfe, and for us, as if at no hand they could stand together. Surely Mr. *W.* when he compil'd and wrote this answere, he wrote it both for himselfe, that is: for the discharge of such a *conscience* as he hath; and for others also, that is, for the good, benefit and *instruction* of mee, and many others. And Saint *Bernard* in that 190. *Epistle*, (cited by Mr. *W.* himselfe, afterward) speaking of the work of *Redemption* wrought by *Christ*, affirmeth it to have beene, *Opus aque nostrum, & suum, & Angelorum*, that is, a *worke* indifferently ours, and his owne, and the *Angels*: and then goeth on, shewing how respectively.

Fourthly, (and lastly) it would cost him many of his thoughts, and much of his Learning, to give a sufficient and cleare accompt, how it should any way intrench, or so much as looke towards the deniall of *Christs God-head*, to conceive that *Christ* might be bound to fulfill the *righteousnes* of the *Law*, for himselfe. I conceive it tends farre more dangerously to shake the truth of his *humanity*, to deny that he was any waies bound to keepe the *Law* for himselfe. And as the error of the *vbiquitarie* tends to dissolve the truth of his *manhood, via naturali*, so doth this opinion of Mr. *W.* (which yet he maintaines with that fearelesse confidence) as farre as yet I am able to see into it, tend to the same end, *via morali*.

It is marvailous improbable unto me, that hee should be the Seed of the Woman, who by the Law of his creation should not be bound, to keepe that *Law*, which both the man and the Woman stood bound to keepe in their innocencie. And as the personall *union* with the *God-head*, could not privilege his *humane nature*, or *Body*, against those properties which are *naturall*, and *essentiall* to it, as *locality*, *quantity*, *finiteness*, *commensurablenes* to its place, nor *communicate* or convey over to it, those properties of *immensitie*, *vbiquity*, *omnipre-*

sence

ſence, &c. which are *eſſentiall* to the *Divine nature*. So neither could it priviledge his *manhood*, againſt thoſe *morall habitudes*, *relations*, or *conditions*, which are as *eſſentiall* to ſuch a creature in another way, as *viz.* ſubjection unto *God*, obligation of ſerving him, and fulfilling his will &c.

Concerning *Chriſt's* meriting his exaltation, I ſhall not ſtrive with him for the preſent. Onely (I beleeve) wee have neither of us waded ſo farre (in our meditations) into thoſe *Scriptures*, which ſpeak to this point, but that we may wade yet deeper, and know more concerning it, then we do. As *viz.* *Rev.* 5. 12. *Heb.* 12 2. *Phil.* 2. 7, 8, 9, *&c.* *Luk* 24. 26. &c.

There remaine now but two little ſhovel-fulls more of the *dunghill* or heap of *lies* that troubled Mr. *W.* ſo exceſſively, to be removed, and then the ſtreet (in this place) will be cleane.

„ *Another groſſe errour* (he ſaith) is, that I call *faith* „ and *beleeving*, a thing done and performed by us, „ when as the *Apoſtle* affirmes, and all *Chriſtians* con„ feſſe that our *beleeving* is not of our ſelves, but the „ *gift* of *God &c.* Surely Mr. *W.* hath as rare a *guift* of making groſſe *errours*, as King *Midas* had of making Gold.

Quicquid contigerat &c. that is what ere he toucht, his touch made gliſtering gold: ſo it ſeemes, whatſoever Mr. *W.* caſt's his eye upon, becomes a groſſe error *ipſo facto*: but (I hope) not without bale or maine prize. *Though Faith be the gift of God*, that is, the *grace* and *ſpirituall ſtrength* by which we *beleeve*: yet is there no *Apoſtle* that affirmes, nor *Chriſtian* (that I know) that confeſſeth, that the *Chriſtians beleeving*, is *Gods* act of *beleeving*: or that denyes, but that men themſelves are the *beleevers*, though not of themſelves, nor by their owne ſtrength. But as *Ariſtotle's* Proverb is: εἰ τὸ ὕδωρ πνίγει, τί δεῖ πίνειν; that is, if water choakes mee, what then ſhall I dranke?

If Mr. *W.* makes groſſe *errours* of ſuch *expreſſions* as
to theſe, hee is not a man for mee to ſpeake: when I have waſh'd my hands of him this once, I hope I ſhall foule them no more.

Wee are now come to the very bottome of the *dung-hill*, and are neere hand of being ſweet and cleane. But the man is in ſome diſtreſſe of thoughts, whether hee ſhould call that which remaineth, a *groſſe abſurdity*, or rather a *blaſphemy*: but ſurely hee will be as advited in his choyce betweene them, as men are when they chuſe *Lobſters*: he will chuſe the heavier. But in this particular he deales more cowardly with me then in all the reſt. Till now he came before mee and ſmote mee in the *face*, his onely *offence* being that he did wrongfully: but now he comes behind my back, and at unawares knocks me downe to *Hell* with a double *club*, or with the *Apoſtles yron Mace* of an *Anathema Maranatha*, nor for any *offence* of mine at all, but for his owne *forgery*, who *Ananias*-like, keeps back part of „ my wordes, and preſents what hee pleaſeth for my „ aſſertion. He chargeth me, that I here maintaine, „ that teaching *juſtification* by *Chriſt*, and his *righteouſ-* „ *nes*, is the caſting of a *ſnare* upon men, and not opening the *dore* of *life* and *ſalvation* to them. I ſhall need no other *compurgators* from this *crime*, but onely the ſetting downe mine owne wordes, which are theſe: whereas to have ſaid thus unto them, that they muſt be *juſtified* by *Chriſt*, or by *Chriſts righteouſnes*, and withall not to have plainely ſignified, what *God* requireth of them, and will accept at their hand, to give them part and *fellowſhip* in that *righteouſnes*, or *juſtification* which is by *Chriſt*, and without which they could not be *juſtified*, had beene rather to have caſt a *ſnare* upon them, then to have opened a *dore* of *life* and *ſalvation* unto them. Well: of Mr. *W.* I will ſpeake no evill, for all this *leger-de-maine*: but if ſome other man had ſerv'd me ſo, I ſhould hardly have refrayned from calling out to him

--Ὦμοι ἀναιδείην ἐπιείμενε, κερδαλεόφρον, that is,

Ah craftie Mate, clad with bold impudence.

But for Mr. *W.*--*Sit ſatis ut pœnam culpa ſecunda ferat.* that is,

'T ſhall be enough his next time fault to puniſh.

It is like indeed, that this will prove but a very ſmall *gratification* to him his next *offence* (I feare) is even at the *dore*. In the meane ſeaſon my *heap* of *lies* mixt with *contradictions*, is quite vaniſh'd: and a *heap* of Mr. *Ws. errours, abſurdities, falſe* and *forged cavillations*, left in the ſtead of it.

The firſt Argument reduced &c. But here Mr. *W.* ſtumbles at another *heap* of *manifeſt* and *impudent lies*: and in the cloſe of his *Anſwere*, hee takes his leave with this ſweet and *courteous ſalutation*: Thus you ſee how he hath bent his *tongue* and pen, like a *bow* for *lies*, and ſhootes them forth thick and threefold like poyſon'd arrowes, as if his *Quiver* were the *Armory* of the *Father* of *lyers*, the *Prince* of *darkeneſſe*. Can any man thinke amiſſe of him, that utters from time to time, ſuch gracious wordes as theſe? Surely the *Prince* of *darkeneſſe* doth not thinke amiſſe of him. Well: but I muſt take ſpade and ſhovell in hand, and to worke againe: Mr. *W.* hath laid a new *dunghill* before my *dore*, and I am ſure that he that layd it, will not remove it, therefore I my ſelfe muſt. The firſt manifeſt and *impudent lye* (which he makes the top or head of this *dunghill*) is, that I affirme it, to be a ſtrange and harſh *expreſſion*, to expreſſe the *imputation* of *Chriſts righteouſnes*, by ſaying that *Faith* is *imputed* to men for *righteouſnes*. Suppoſe it be a miſtake, to call it a ſtrange and harſh *expreſſion*, it is farre from being a manifeſt, and furtheſt of all, from being an *impudent lye*, Mr. *W.* (ſurely) is miſtaken in the poynt of *impudence*,

Mr. W. page 34.

pudence, here: it is not the lye, but the *ſlaunder* that is *impudent*. But how doth hee prove it to be ſo much as a miſtake, or *untruth*, that ſuch an *expreſſion* would „ be ſtrange and harſh, to carrie that ſence, which hee „ is reſolved to force upon it? His *demonſtrative proofe* „ is this. becauſe it is no ſtrange or harſh *expreſſion*, to „ uſe a *figure* of *ſpeech*: and by *Faith* and *beleeving* to „ meane the ſtate, or a man in the ſtate of a true *beleever*, „ and by *righteouſneſſe*, the ſtate, or a man in the ſtate „ of *righteouſnes &c.* Mr. *Ws.* ordinary *Readers* had „ need have an *Oedipus* ſtill at hand, to find out the *Enigma's* of his proofes and *arguments*: for poore *Davuſſes* have much adoe to underſtand any thing. It is true, there are many *figures* of *ſpeech*, which are no ſtrange or harſh *expreſſions*: but firſt there are few plain and direct *expreſſions* (as we have proved this to bee) which will not bee made ſtrange and harſh, if men will *metamorphoſe* them into *metalepticall* and *figurative*: as the ſweeteſt *wine* changed, becomes the ſharpeſt *vinegar*. Secondly, if men will take upon them to coyne new formes of *ſpeaking*, and will call theſe, *figures*, theſe may well be ſtrange and harſh *ex-* „ *preſſions*, which is Mr. *Ws.* beloved *enterpriſe* in this „ place. He ſaith and affirmeth, that by *Faith* and *be-* „ *leeving*, to meane the ſtate, or a man in the ſtate of „ a true *beleever*, is no ſtrange or harſh *expreſſion*. I would therefore aske him, whether this would not bee a very ſtrange and harſh *expreſſion*, to ſay that *Faith* is *juſtified* by *Faith*, his meaning being onely this, that a *beleever* is *juſtified* by *faith*. And yet by the rules of his *Rhetorick*, it ſhould bee but a *Divine figure* of *ſpeech*. So againe, whether to ſay that *righteouſnes* is a member of the *myſticall* body of *Chriſt*, meaning, that a *righteous* perſon is ſuch, would not be a ſtrange and harſh *expreſſion*.

Againe ſuppoſe it bee granted, that ſometimes the *abſtract* or ſimple *forme*, may be uſed for the concrete,

as

as *righteouſnes*, for *righteous*, or *juſtified* perſons, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. ſo *circumciſion*, for *circumciſed*, *Philip.* 3. 3. *Election*, for *elected*, *Rom.* 11. 7. and ſuch like, yet to put the act or *action*, for the *agent* (as Mr. *VV.* would here have it, *beleeving* for the *beleever*) is more ſeldome (if at all) found: and conſequently the more ſtrange and harſh *expreſſion*.

Yet again: neither will Mr. *Ws. metaleptical oyle*, at all mollifie or ſmooth the harſhneſſe of the *Apoſtles expreſſion Rom.* 4. 3. (though it bee anoynted therewith) if this *interpretation* be put upon it. *Abraham beleeved God* (ſaith the *Apoſtle*) and it (that is, this his *beleeving God*, that is, ſaith Mr. *VV.* his ſtate of *beleeving*, or the *beleever* himſelfe) was *imputed to him for righteouſnes*, that is, for the ſtate of a *righteous* man.

Qui me in me quærit, non me, ut me invenerit in me.
that is,

Who in my ſelfe ſhall ſeeke mee, hardly he
ſhall in my ſelfe, like to my ſelfe, e're find me.

I appeale to all eares that have not quite loſt their *palate* and *taſte*, whether any *expreſſion* can (lightly) be more *ſtrange*, *harſh*, and *uncouth*, then that which Mr. *W.* hath put upon the *Apoſtle* in this place. Thus you ſee the firſt *manifeſt impudent lie* (as Mr. *W.* elegantly phraſeth it) is neither *lie* nor *impudent*: but onely *manifeſt*, and that, a *truth*.

„ A ſecond *impudent lie* (like the former) is, that I ſay that this *figure* of *ſpeech*, (*viz.* wherewith Mr. *W.* adorneth, as he thinkes; deformeth, as I thinke, theſe paſ„ ſages of the *Apoſtle*) is not to be found in all the *Apoſtles writings*. He ſhould have done well firſt to have found it, and then it had bin more tolerable to have called it a *lie*, in him that had denied it. But to call it a *manifeſt* and *impudent lie*, there had beene ſmall reaſon howſoever: becauſe Mr. *W.* himſelfe, who pretends

to finde it, pretends to find it onely in the utmoſt corner or nooke of one onely *chapter*, *Rom.* 2. and the foure laſt *verſes*. But what *non-ſenſicall work* hee makes with, how he figures and misfigures thoſe paſſages, we have ſufficiently acquainted the *Reader* from his owne pen formerly.

3. *The third bold lie, and manifeſt falſhood* is, that the *Apoſtle* time after time uſeth the *phraſe* of *Faith*, or *beleeving imputed &c.* without ever explaining himſelfe, or changing his *ſpeech*. Well: how doth he prove his *ſubſtantives* (for he takes it for granted, it ſeemes, that his *Epithetes* muſt bee abated him in his proofes) how doth he prove either *lie* or *falſhood* ſimply, in ſuch an *affirmation*? yes he produceth the 6. and 11. *ver.* of this chapter, where it is ſaid, that *God imputeth righteouſnes*, and that *righteouſnes* is *imputed*. Hee might as well have brought forth his letters of *Orders*, or his *licence* to preach, and made them his proofe. For theſe *phraſes* ſpeake not of *Faith*: and how then „ ſhould they explaine the *imputation* of it? yes that „ which he calleth *Faith* (ſaith he) *verſe* 3. and 5. ſay„ ing there, that it is *imputed* for *righteouſnes*, here hee „ explaining himſelfe, and changing his *ſpeech*, cal„ leth it *righteouſnes*. But (good Mr. *W.*) what doth „ he call *righteouſnes*, here? that which hee called *Faith* before, *verſe* 3. and 5. *&c.* why not rather that which he called *righteouſnes* before? As for example, where he ſaith, *verſe* 13. that the *promiſe* was not given to *Abraham*, or to his *ſeed*, by the *Law*: why ſhould I rather, by the word *Abraham* in this place, underſtand *David*, mentioned *verſe* 6. then that very *Abraham* ſpoken of *ver.* 1. 2. 3: So by the word *righteouſnes*, *verſe* 6. and 11. why ſhould I rather underſtand *Faith*, which is ſaid to be *imputed* for *righteouſnes*, *verſe* 3. and 5. then that *righteouſnes* it ſelfe, for (or unto which) *Faith* is there ſaid to be *imputed*?

Againe, let Mr. *W's*, reaſon-leſſe *ſuppoſition* be admitted

mitted, *viz.* that by *righteouſnes* in theſe places, the *Apoſtle* meaneth *Faith*, ſee what a faire market he hath brought his *hogges* unto. Vpon this *ſuppoſition*, when the *Apoſtle* ſaith, *that God imputeth righteouſnes to him that beleeveth*, the meaning muſt be, that *God imputeth Faith* to him that *beleeveth*, and ſo it will bee ſo farre from being an explaining of himſelfe in his former *expreſſion*, that it will rather obſcure what he had directly and plainely ſaid before. But concerning the true *importance* and meaning of this *phraſe*, *imputing righteouſnes*, wee have diſcuſſed it before: where wee found Mr. *VV.* ſitting, quite beſide the Cuſhion. Thus wee ſee how this ſouldiour charging his muſket deep with powder and browne paper, but wanting *bullets*, makes terrible cracks onely, but doth no execution at all, except it bee in the recoyle of his *engine*, upon himſelfe.

His ſecond Argument is briefly, &c. Behold a *miracle*: Mr. *W.* here reaſons, and doth not rayle. I hope his powder by this time is well ſpent: and for the time to come, he will be μαλακώτερος ἀμφᾶσθαι; more ſoft to handle. It may be his paſſion being downe, his *intellectualls* will advance. Well: we muſt trie him hot and cold. My *Argumens* here riſeth thus: *That which is imputed* for *righteouſnes*, to a *beleever*, is ſaid to bee his *Faith*, before it be *imputed*: but the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, is not any mans *righteouſnes*, before it be *imputed*: Therefore by *Faith* (in theſe places) cannot bee meant the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*. Mr. *VV.* page 35.

To this Mr. *VV.* frames a *bimembred* anſwere: the „ firſt member as *ambiguous* and *impertinent*, as the lat„ ter untrue and reaſonleſſe. Firſt hee ſaith, that the „ *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, by ſpirituall *union* with *Chriſt*, „ is as truely the *beleevers* as his *Faith* is. But the queſtion betweene my good Friend and me, is not, whether the *righteouſneſſe* of *Chriſt*, be the *beleevers*, or no (we are friends in good earneſt ſo farre) nor whether the

the *beleever* bee *juſtified* by the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, but whether it bee his, in ſuch a manner, as it was *Chriſts* himſelfe, that is, whether he be *juſtified* or made *righteous* with it, as *Chriſt* was, or whether he bee *juſtified*, or *counted righteous* onely for it, and not with it. As a man may be cloathed for his money, but cannot be cloathed with it. So the queſtion is, whether the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, be the *beleevers* cloathing, or *garment* it ſelfe, (formally and properly taken) or whether it be the money and price, by which his *cloathing* and *garments* were bought. But the *Scriptures* he brings to prove his firſt *aſſertion* (or part of his anſwere) are as *impertinent* for proofe, as the *aſſertion* it ſelfe is to the buſineſſe in hand. To prove the *righteouſneſſe* of *Chriſt* to be the *beleevers*, as his *Faith* is, he miſcites thoſe two *Scriptures* 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. and 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. In the firſt it is ſaid indeed, that *Chriſt* is made unto us *righteouſnes*: but what is this to prove, that the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* is made ours, as our *Faith* is. The *perſon* of *Chriſt*, and the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, differ *toto genere* And ſuppoſe it had beene ſaid, that the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* had bin made *righteouſnes* to us, or our *righteouſnes* (which yet are *expreſſions* that the *Scriptures* know not) yet would it not follow, that the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* muſt needs be ours, as our *Faith* is ours. The other *Scripture* turnes the back upon his purpoſe, after the ſame manner. It is onely here ſaid, that *beleevers are made the righteouſnes of God in Chriſt*: that is, the *juſtified* ones of *God*, by meanes of *Chriſt*, their great *ſin-offering*, and *attonement*. Here is nothing ſpoken concerning the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, made formally ours by *imputation*; but onely our *juſtification* meritoriouſly wrought, and purchaſed by him, ſignified.

„ But ſecondly he anſweres, that this *righteouſnes* of
„ *Chriſt* is the *beleevers*, in order of *nature*, before it
„ be *counted* (or *imputed*) for *righteouſnes* unto him.
„ And this hee proves with this left-handed *argument*,

„ that

„ that *GOD*, whoſe *judgement* is according to „ truth, doth not *count* that to the *beleever*, which „ he hath not before, or at the ſame time doth com- „ municate to him. What is this but that poore trick „ in *Logick*, which they call *Petitio principii*, or beg- ging the Queſtion, right up and downe. He proves the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* to be the *beleevers*, before it be *imputed* to him, becauſe *God* doth not *impute* that to him, which he hath not before: where hee takes that for granted which is the *Cardo controverſie*, *viz.* that *God* doth *impute* the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* (in his ſence) to a *beleever*. And then againe, here is nothing but *Idem per idem*, the ſame thing prov'd by it ſelfe, (upon the matter) he proves the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* to be a *beleevers*, before it is *imputed*, becauſe *God* doth not *impute* it, before it be his. Which is as if he ſhould ſay: the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* is a *beleevers*, before it be *imputed*, becauſe, before it be his, *God* doth not *impute* it. But the *poſitive* ſtrength of it is even as lit- tle, as the *relative:* neither is there more *truth*, then dependance in it. For if the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* bee the *beleevers*, before the *imputation*, to what purpoſe is the *imputation* at all? whereof there can be no other reaſon given, but onely the making that a *beleevers*, which was not his before. And Mr. *VV.* himſelfe had told us before, *page* 30. of his *diſcourſe*, that we are not *juſtified* by the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, as it is his, but as it is ours: which ever and anon he affirmeth to be, by *communication* or *imputation*. Beſides if the *righteouſ- nes* of *Chriſt* be the *beleevers*, before it be *imputed* then doth not *juſtification* ſtand in the *imputation* of *Chriſts righteouſnes*, but is complete before and without it: for he, whoſe the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* is, is (doubtleſſe) a *juſtified* perſon.

Concerning that which he calls his ſecond *Anſwere*, more then an *Anſwere* hath beene given to it formerly.

In his *Anſwere* to my third *Argument*, hee gently

cenſures my ignorance in *Rhetoricall tropes*, and lovingly obſerves my vaine *tergiverſation*, and ignorantly conceites, that an *argument* might be fram'd out of the third *verſe* ſtrong againſt mee. Well: let us paſſe a while upon theſe: the Seas are ſomewhat lower and leſſe growne then they were. My *argument* here is: that the *obiect* of that *faith*, which is here ſaid to bee *imputed*, is *God* himſelfe, or the *promiſe* of *God*, and not the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*: for to conceive, that by *God*, is meant the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, is to ſet up a *trope*, which is not a *figure*, but a monſter of ſpeech. How now doth Mr. *VV.* anſwere this, and prove that by *God*, is here meant the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, and that by a *Rhetoricall trope*, without any ſtrangeneſſe, or *monſtrouſnes* of ſpeech? If he had not a good Friend indeed of the *figure Metalepſis*, which like a ſure pinhorſe in his teame, will never faile him at a dead pull, he could never have driven the way hee hath gone, thus farre, and (*doubtleſſe*) would have beene faſt in this ſlow, (however yet he recovers himſelfe.) But by vertue of this *benigne figure*, he can make *Mercuries* ſtatue of any wood, and make plaine, nay *elegant* and *gracefull* ſpeech, of ſuch *phraſes* and *expreſſions* as would aſtoniſh *William Lilie*, and put *Tully* and *Quintilian* halfe beſides their *Rhetoricall* witts. But let us ſee what *Metalepſis*, and he can doe together, to cleere the buſineſſe in queſtion. He proves, that by *God*, who was here the *obiect* of *Abrahams Faith* (for, he *beleeved God:* and that, it was *imputed* unto him for *righteouſnes*) is to bee underſtood the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, „ thus: becauſe no man in *beleeving* by a true *faith* can „ ſeparate *Chriſts ſatisfaction* and *righteouſnes* from „ *Chriſt* himſelfe: If he enjoyes *Chriſt* himſelfe, he en„ joyes his *benefits* alſo *&c. Dicite Iò Paan*: Strike „ up a triumph. Becauſe a man cannot in *beleeving* ſeparate the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* from *Chriſt*, therefore by the word *God*, muſt neceſſarily bee underſtood the

righteouſnes

righteouſnes of *Chriſt*. But firſt I mervaile why Mr. *W.* throughout this whole diſcourſe, ſtill mentions the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, with the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*: whereas I never to this day, ſo much as thought of, or intended the leaſt difference, or diſpute about the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, but onely about his active *obedience* to the *Law*, whether this bee ſo *imputed* to a *beleever*, that by vertue of this *imputation*, hee may claime *Heaven* in right of the firſt *Covenant*, *doe this and live*, that is, whether a *beleever* bee formally *righteous* with *Chriſts righteouſnes imputed*, or no: Therefore his *importune* mention, and thruſting in the *paſſive obedience* or *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, from place to place, without any occaſion or neceſſity, can argue nothing elſe, but an exulcerate deſire, to repreſent mee to the world, as an enemy or denyer of *Chriſts ſatisfaction*.

But ſecondly, what though a man cannot ſeparate the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* from *Chriſt* himſelfe in *beleeving*? doth it therefore follow, that the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* muſt needs be the *object* of *Faith*, as *juſtifying*? much leſſe doth it follow, that this *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, muſt needs be ſignified, either by the *word*, *God*, or by the *promiſe* of *God* concerning *Chriſt* (which himſelfe granteth to have beene the *object* of *Abrahams Faith* in this place.) A man cannot ſeparate the ſoule of *Chriſt*, or the members of his humane body; from *Chriſt* himſelfe in *beleeving*: yet neither the ſoule of *Chriſt*, nor any member of his body is the *object* of *Faith*, as *juſtifying*. For then whoſoever *beleeved Chriſt* had a ſoule, or a head, hands *&c.* ſhould be *juſtified*. Beſides, it is not altogether ſo true (as perhaps he thinks it is) that the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, cannot be ſeparated from *Chriſt* himſelfe, *in beleeving*, at leaſt from *Chriſt* conſidered, as the *object* of *juſtifying faith*. The *Turkes* at this day *beleeve Chriſt* to have beene a *righteous man*, and conſequently *beleeve* his *righteouſnes*: yet doe they not *beleeve* in *Chriſt* himſelfe, *juſtifyingly*.

As for that which followeth in the remainder of his „ anſwere to this *argument, &c.* as his charge of vaine *ter-* „ *giverſation*, of bringing *Scriptures* to confute my ſelfe with the reſt, I conceive them to bee of that manifeſt *inconſequence* and *indigeſtedneſſe*, that I had rather truſt my *Reader* with his owne apprehenſions concerning them, then adventure to trouble him with any long confutation.

Quilibet ignavus precipitata premit.

that is,

What of it ſelfe is tumbling downe,
With little ſtrength downe may be throwne.

Chriſts righteouſnes, can in no tollerabe *ſence*, be cal-
Mr. *W.* p. 38. led that *Faith*, whereby *Abraham beleeved* in *God*, who quickneth the dead. This is my next *Argument*, to prove that by the *word*, *Faith*, in theſe *paſſages*, is not meant the *active obedience* of *Chriſt*. And how doth „ Mr. *W.* deliver himſelfe out of the hand of this ene- „ mie? by this charme: becauſe *God* neither quick- „ ned *Chriſt*, *nor raiſed him from the dead, till he had ful-* „ *filled all righteouſnes*. If this be an Anſwere, much joy may Mr. *W.* and his friends have of it. Onely let me ſay this to him: that neither did *God* raiſe up *Chriſt* from the dead, till he had layne three dayes and three nights in the *grave*: and yet I conceive Mr. *W.* will hardly find his lying three dayes and three nights in the *grave*, any where called *Faith*, or ſignified by that *expreſſion*.

But *Quoniam vult Alexander Deus eſſe, Deus eſto.*

that is, Since *Alexander* needs a *God* will be,
(Much good, may't doe him) a *God* let him be.

My fift *Argument* was: *Abrahams Faith*, which was *imputed* to him, was ſuch a *Faith*, wherein hee was not weake, neither doubted of *Gods promiſe &c. ver.* 19. 20. This

20. This can be no deſcription of the *righteouſnes* of „ *Chriſt*. *Ergo &c.* How are we beaten out of this „ field? with this wodden dagger: The more ſtrong „ *Abraham* was in *Faith &c.* the more firmely he was „ *united* to *Chriſt*, and had more full *communion* of his „ *righteouſnes &c.* therefore this *argument* makes a- „ gainſt me. I think (indeed) the *argument*, as much as the *Anſwere*, and both alike. The *Queſtion* is not, whether *Abraham* had *communion* with *Chriſt* in his *righteouſnes*, or no, either more full or leſſe full: but whether that which is here ſpoken and affirmed concerning *Abrahams faith*, can with any poſſible congruitie of *ſpeech*, be applyed to the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, and be conceived, as ſpoken of that. Was that *Faith*, whereby *Abraham* doubted not of *Gods promiſe*, the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*? or rather was not the *promiſe* of *God*, that whereby *Abraham* doubted not of *Chriſts righteouſnes*? But my *Antagoniſt* ſtarts one new *notion* in *Divinity*, which I doe not remember that I have met with all either from the pen or mouth of any *Divine* hitherto. *viz.* degrees in *juſtification*. For that *expreſſion*, *communion* with *Chriſt* in his *righteouſnes*, is ſtill uſed to ſignifie *juſtification*: and therefore if *Abraham*, by meanes of the ſtrength of his *Faith*, had fuller *communion* with *Chriſt* in his *righteouſnes*, then other *beleevers* have, hee muſt needs bee more *juſtified* then they: and conſequently their *juſtification* by *Chriſt* muſt be imperfect.

My next *argument* he turnes over with the ſame wet finger. The *argument* was this: *Abrahams beleeving*, that *God* who had *promiſed*, was able to performe, was the *Faith imputed* to him. But this was not *Chriſts* „ *righteouſnes*. *Ergo.* This Mr. *VV.* confuteth (or ra- „ ther confirmeth) by this *Anſwere*: The more that „ *Abraham* reſted on *Gods* power *&c* The more *com-* „ *munion* he had of *Chriſts righteouſnes*, and the more „ juſtly did *God count* him for a *righteous* man, and *im-*

„ *pute Christs righteousnes* unto him. I thought to have turn'd *Argument* and *Answere* loose together; and to have suffered them, each to stand, or fall, by their owne strength, without bringing in any second to umpire: but that there is an ill sounding *phrase* or two in the *answere*, which (at best) deserve rods, if not *Scorpions*. Besides the *repetition* of that *expression*, censured (and that for no good) in the former *answere*, hee „ useth such streyns as these, that the more *Abraham* „ rested on *Gods* power, the MORE JUSTLY did *God count* him a *righteous man*, and *impute Christs righteousnes* to him. Which let *Charity* her selfe be the *interpres*, cannot but imply, that *God* doth with lesse *justice count a weak beleever, a righteous man*, and with lesse *justice impute* the *righteousnes* of *Christ* unto him, then to a strong. I know if Mr. *W.* had me thus upon the hipp, I should bee violently throwne upon my back, and beaten when I were downe, with the fist of lies, *heresie*, *blasphemy &c.* but I will let him gently downe and onely advise him betweene him and mee, to speake more advisedly and considerately hereafter.

interpres

My next *Argument* is: That *Faith* which *God imputes* to us for *righteousnes*, is said to bee, our *beleeving* on him which rais'd *Christ* from the *dead*. But the *righteousnes* of *Christ*, is not our *beleeving* on him which rais'd *Christ* from the *dead*. *Ergò*. How doth Mr. *W.* fence this blow? *Crimine ab uno-Disce omnes*: He that one *Answere* hath of his, hath all. I cannot properly say that which hee answereth, but that which hee here saith, is this: our *beleeving* „ in *God* who raised *Christ* from the dead, is our assure- „ ance that *Christ* hath made full *satisfaction* for us, and „ therefore the *righteous God*, who raised him up, is *sa-* „ *tisfied* for us, and hath accepted his *righteousnes* for „ our *righteousnesse*, and *&c.* concluding thus. Therefore „ this is for us, and not against us. Surely a Shoomaker might as well sell Scabberds for Shooes, as Scholars

put

put off Arguments with ſuch *impertinent diſcourſes* as theſe, inſtead of *Anſwers*; For what is there in all this to prove (or ſo much as to colour over a proofe) that by that *Faith* which is deſcribed to be our *beleeving* on him that raiſed *Chriſt* from the dead, muſt needs be meant the *righteouſnes*, or *active obedience of Chriſt*? or what reaſonable man is there under Heaven, that can imagine, that the Apoſtle intending to deſcribe the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, ſhould deſcribe it thus: *The righteouſnes of Chriſt is our beleeving on him that raiſed up Chriſt from the dead.* This is the *quinteſſence* & *extract* of Mr. *Ws. anſwer.*

My eight (and laſt *Argument*) either he or his Scribe ſo defaceth in the laying it downe, that it rather lookes like one of his *Anſwers*, then any of my *Arguments*.

"He calls it, *a bare affirmation*, that to take *faith in a* "*proper ſenſe*, is more Plaine and cleere, and better - "beleeving the Apoſtle in this *diſcourſe*, where he "largely handles the point of *iuſtification*. Indeed if this were my *Argument*, Mr. *Ws.* Anſwer would ſerve. The ſumme of my *Argument*, (more at large opened in my papers) is this, The *point* or *queſtion* of *imputation* in *iuſtification*, being onely handled in this paſſage of Scripture, and no where elſe *explained*; it is no waies probable, but that the Apoſtle ſhould ſpeake ſomewhat *diſtinctly*, and *plainely*, of the nature of it: otherwiſe he might ſeeme rather deſirous to lay a ſtumbling in the way, then to write any thing for the learning and comfort of *Chriſtians*, &c. To this Mr. *W.* anſwereth "*mum.* Onely he gravely inſtructeth us, that it is "more comfortable for us to reſt on *Chriſts righteouſ-* "*neſſe*, &c. then to build on *Faith*, which in the beſt "is mingled, and ſtained with many doubtings often- "times. Therefore the Apoſtle undoubtedly intends "*Chriſts righteouſnes*; and ſo he doth expreſſe in plaine "words (to another purpoſe) *cap* 5. 19. and 10. 4.

In which words he maketh an *oppoſition* betweene things of the moſt *direct* and *eſſentiall ſubordination* that

can

can be, (and which doe *inseparably involve* one the other) *viz.* resting on *Christs righteousnes*, and building on *Faith*. It is impossible that any man should build on *Faith*, that doth not rest on *Christs righteousnes*, that is, the *satisfaction* that he hath made: because *Faith* is a *resting* on this *satisfaction*. And so againe: a *resting* on *Christs righteousnes*, includes a *building* on *Faith*; For who is there that will or can *rest* upon this *righteousnes*, except he *beleeves*, that such a *resting* or *beleeving* as this, will stand him in stead? Sure I am, that *Paul* built upon *Faith*, for his *justification*, as well as on the *righteousnes* of *Christ* himselfe (as Mr. *Ws.* beloved *phrase* is) though in a different manner, (which hath been formerly explained) when he said: We know that a man is not *justified* by the *works* of the *Law*, but by the *Faith* of *Iesus Christ*, and have *beleeved* in *Iesus Christ*, that we might be *justified* by the *faith of Christ*, *&c. Gal.* 2. 16. And as *Christ* speaketh concerning himselfe, *Iohn* 12.44. *He that beleeveth in me, beleeveth not in me, but in him that sent me:* that is, not so much in me, as in him that sent me: So may it be sayd, that he that buildeth on *faith*, buildeth not on *faith*, but on the *truth* and *faithfulnes* of him, who hath promised forgivenesse of sinnes and *salvation* to him that *beleeveth*. And for the mixture or stayning of *faith* with many doubtings this is no consideration at all, to deferre or keepe a man from building upon it, if it be a *faith* unfeigned and true: because there is the same *justification* and *salvation* promised to the weakest *faith*, and to the strongest.

Mr. *W.* p. 39. After these *Arguments &c.* In this passage he pretends, to countermine and dissolve the *Answers* I give to „ those places, where the words, *faith*, and *hope*, are u„ sed to signify their *object*. And here I am arrested a„ gaine by this troublesome Bayliffe, for notable *tergiversation*. I know not what he calls *tergiversation*: he that reades the passage glanced at by him, will hardly say, that either I betray, or turne my back upon the cause

I undertake. But if that be *tergiverſation*, to diſſemble and turne the back upon the maine ſtrength of thoſe things which are pretended to be anſwered, and onely to catch and ſnatch here and there, where any word ſeemes to lye a little looſe: then I may truely ſay, that the Fox is the finder, and the *tergiverſator* is, from whence the accuſation comes. I will not be ſo troubleſome to my Reader here, as to relate the paſſage hee ſtrikes at: there are ſome copies thereof, in ſome mens hands, and more (I conceive) may be taken upon this occaſion, but the ſubſtance of the *anſwere* he gives to this paſſa ge, conſiſts (chiefly) of 2 or 3 untruths. As firſt, where he ſaith, that eſpecially the act of *beliefe* and *hope*, are to be underſtood *Gal.* 1.22 & 3.23. *Col.* 1.5. *Cujus contrarium verum eſt.* 2. where he ſaith that he hath prov'd the *righteouſnes or active obedience of Chriſt*, to be the object of *Faith*, as *juſtifying*: whereas he hath not in all his *diſcourſe*, made the leaſt haire of that head, either black or white. 3. (and laſtly) where he affirmes this *righteouſneſſe* of *Chriſt*, to be the onely *proper object* of *Faith*, as *juſtifying*: whereas it hath been evictingly *demonſtrated*, that it is neither the *proper*, nor leſſe *proper obiect* thereof, as ſuch, and alſo that the *Scriptures* no where ſpeake ſo of it. And yet as the *Iſraelites* when they had made their golden *Calfe*, were not *ſatisfied* therewith, but rejoyced over the work of their owne hands, and *eate* and *drank* and *played before it*. So neither doth this man content himſelfe, to ſpeake his pleaſure in *untruths*, but boldly concludes thus *inſultingly* and *triumphantly*, over what he had ſayd againſt me. Thus he ſhamefully trifles to ſhew his *impudencie*, and *perverſnes*. If he that trifles moſt, or ſhewes moſt *impudency*, and *perverſneſſe*, ſhould forfaite his *learning* to the other, I beleeve Mr. *W.* would ſoone be as *ignorant* in *Rhetorique*, as I am; and I every whit as skillfull and expert as he.

M.W. p. 40. Now we come to the fift and laſt act of our *Tragoedie*. Where before he comes to anſwere all my *teſtimonies* at once, he hath a great mind to get up into *Gods Throne*, and there to act the Divels parr. For whereas I *ingenuouſly confeſſed* that I had not read all the *teſtimonies* (produced in the Authors themſelves, (neither indeed is my poore *Library* ſo well furniſhed) he firſt undertakes to know my *heart* and *intent*, (which is the *prerogative of God*) and then againſt all *reaſonable* and *charitable conſtruction*, of my *ingenuous confeſſion*, he chargeth me, not "to have made it out of *humility*, *and modeſty*, but out "of *Satanicall ſubtilty*, to vent my *poyſonfull lies* under "the *perſon* of another, as the Divel did vent his, by the Serpent. *Gen.* 3. (and now doth by Mr. *W.* his ſucceſſor) which is the expreſſe *part* and *practiſe* of the Divel. *Iob.* 1. 9. 11.

The reaſon (I conceive) why he could think no better of that my *Confeſſion*, then to be made out of *ſubtiltie*, was the faultineſſe of the Standerd in his owne boſome.

The reaſon why the reviling *Scribes*, and *Phariſes*, concluded againſt *Chriſt*, *now hanging on the Croſſe*, *that he could not ſave himſelfe*, (*Mat.* 27. 42.) was onely (or chiefly) this, becauſe if they had bin able to ſave themſelves, they would have done it upon the like occaſion.

" He blames me further, for not being *aſhamed*, or "*bluſhing* to *affirme*, that from the times of *Luther*, and "*Calvin*, the faireſt ſtreame of *interpreters*, run to *water*, "and *refreſh* my *interpretation*. No Mr. *W.* ſeeing men "ſo *bold* and *big fore-headed*, in proclaiming *untruths*; I know no reaſon I have of being *aſhamed*, or *bluſhing* for ſtanding up for the *truth*. And as our *Saviour* ſaith to the *Jewes*, who would faine have had him denyed and retracted what he had ſayd concerning *himſelfe* and his *Father*,

Father: *I know him*, and if I ſhould ſay I know him not, *I ſhould be a liar like unto you. Iohn* 8. 25. So muſt I ſay to Mr. *W.* in this caſe, that ſhould I ſay otherwiſe concerning the judgement of the beſt *interpreters*, ſince *Luther* and *Calvins* time, touching the *Scriptures* in queſtion, then I do, I ſhould be like unto you, and ſpeake what is contrary to the *truth*. What he ſpeakes concerning either *Socinus* or *Arminius*, as being the firſt authors of my *interpretation* hath bin more then refuted long ſince; when by expreſſe *teſtimonies* from themſelves we ſhewed that they lead the *ſenſe* and *interpretation* of theſe *Scriptures*, quite another way, and (of the two) neerer to Mr. *Ws. interpretation* then mine. So far are they off from being the firſt Authors of it, that they do not admit it at al (as far as I can yet ſee) either frō themſelves, or any other approved *Author*. I have named already more then one, or 7 *Orthodox writers*, that hold the *imputation* of *Faith* in a *proper ſenſe*, and am ready to *examine* and *ſcan* the *teſtimonies*, with any *ſober*, and *diſpaſſionate man* whatſoever. And for his tale of *Peter Ainlard*, (as his *Scribe* ſurely hath mis-named him inſtead of *Abilaird*) that was *gelded* for his *incontinencie*; it is well for him that there is not a *Law* of like *penaltie* amongſt us, for *incontinencie* of *tongue*, becauſe I feare then, that Mr. *Ws. manhood* would be one of the firſt that ſhould ſuffer. But for Saint *Bernards* 190 *Epiſtle*, out of which this Tale of a Tub, is pretended to be told, I can heare no ſound of it there, and yet have layd both my eares as cloſe as well I could to heare.

An Anſwere to all his Teſtimonies, &c.

To all? nay (quoth *Bolton*) bate me an ace? There are 17 whereunto there is nothing at all anſwered: In the meane time: *M. W. à p. 41. ad finem.*

Quid dignum tanto ferat hic promissor hiatu?

that is,

What shall this promise-maker have,
In reward of this promise brave?

The old proverb here workes.

Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

that is,

The Mountaines were in travaile sore,
The birth's a Mouse, and nothing more

But first he whets his courage upon the hone of *indignation*, and rageth (after his wonted manner) against my *impudent boasting*, of the generall consent of *Interpreters*, and *inferres*, that a more *odious example*, of *impudencie* and *folly*, cannot be imagined, then here I make my selfe, by making my *folly* and *absurdity*, to strive for *Master-ship* with my *impudence*. I see I shall have new Liveries from my *Mr.* before my old be quite worne up. Well, *I* beleeve, that a more *odious example*, both of *impudencie* and *folly*, may not onely be imagined, but visibly demonstrated, and pointed at with the finger, *I* know where. And for Mr. *Ws.* railing and reviling *speeches*, they are (at the best) but like Silver in *Solomons* dayes, which for the abundance of it, was nothing worth. But except either much *learning*, or somewhat else, had set him and his wits at odds, he could never have affirmed, that no one *Orthodox Divine* either ancient or later, ever understood, by *Faith imputed* for *righteousnes*, *Faith in a proper sence*, but the *satisfaction* and

„ and *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* himſelfe. I make no queſtion but he takes in himſelfe (whoſoever elſe he thruſts out) into the number of *Orthodox Divines*: and how oft hath he, in former paſſages of this very *diſcourſe*, (as hath beene obſerved) affirmed the very ſelfe ſame thing himſelfe, in as ample and expreſſe termes, as I doe.

As for this laſt quarter of his worthy piece, which concern's *Authors* and *teſtimonies*, I ſhall bee very briefe in framing my reply unto it: becauſe I verily *beleeve*, that the *Author* himſelfe would have ſpared it, had hee but rightly underſtood the *opinion* againſt which hee hath armed himſelfe with ſo much fury, and what is meant by *Faith* in a proper *ſence*.

Concerning the *teſtimonies* which he himſelfe brings forth out of the rich *magazine* of his *Library* and *learning*, becauſe they are ſo pregnant and *pertinent* to prove that which no man queſtions, *viz. juſtification* by the *righteouſnes* and *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, in a meritorious *way*, and doe not ſo much as touch or come neere the point in *controverſie*, (except it be in way of *contradiction* to him that produceth them) I take my leave of them (at once) and wiſh them *reſt* and *peace*. Only I cannot but take ſpeciall notice of a very ſtrange piece of *Divinitie* (whereſoever he had it) which drops from him in thoſe *paſſages* where he ſpeakes ſo much to ſo little „ purpoſe, and ſome things with as little truth) concer- „ ning *Calvin*: Here he teacheth, that *ſinnes of comm ſ-* „ *ſion*, are taken away by that part of Chriſts ſatisfaction „ *imputed*, which is called his *paſſive obedience*, or *volun-* „ *tary* ſuffering the *penalty* of the Law: and ſins of *omiſ-* „ *ſion* by his active obedience, in fulfilling the righte- „ ouſneſſe which the Law requires, which is the other „ part of *Chriſts imputed ſatisfaction*. Mr. *W.* talkes „ much (as we have heard) of *heapes* of *lies*, of *here-* *ſies*, *blaſphemies &c.* but here we have a *Lernean* Lake of *hideous* and *portentous Divinity*, things which I ſhould have conceived, that Mr. *W.* would not have *received*

though an *Angel* from *Heaven* ſhould have brought them unto him.

Firſt he affirmes the taking away of *ſinnes* of *omiſſion*, by the *active obedience* of *Chriſt* onely: whereas the *Scriptures* teach expreſſely, that without ſhedding of *blood*, *there is no remiſſion.* (*Heb.* 9. 22.) neither of *ſinnes* of *commiſſion* nor of *omiſsion.* So 1 *Ioh.* 1. 7. *The blond of Ieſus Chriſt his Sonne, cleanſeth us from* ALL *ſinne*: not of *commiſſion* onely, but of *omiſſion* alſo. Againe, *Rev.* 1. 5. *Vnto him that loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins in his blond.* So *Rom.* 4. 25. *who was deliverd to death for our ſins &c.* The *Scripture never* mentioneth any purging or taking away of *ſinne*, but by the *blood, death* and *ſufferings* of *Chriſt*: neither doth it give the leaſt intimation of any diſtinction or *difference* to be made (in this reſpect) betweene *ſinnes* of *omiſsion*, and *commiſſion.* Neither is there any colour or *appearance* of difference betweene them, in *reference* to their *purgation* and *attonement*, there being many *ſinnes* of *omiſſion*, which are much more heynous and grievous, then many *ſinnes* of *Commiſſion.*

Secondly, he makes the *active obedience* or *righteouſnes* of *Chriſts* life, of like conſideration, with his *death* and *paſſive obedience*, *viz. penall* and *ſatisfactory*: as if to live *righteouſly* and *holily*, had bin a *puniſhment* layd upon *Chriſt*, to make *ſatisfaction* for all the *ſinnes* of *Omiſſion*, whereas himſelfe affirmeth, that it was his meate, (not his *puniſhment*) *to doe the will of him that ſent him. Iohn* 4. 34. The *Papiſts* indeed make prayer, and other their *ſerving God*, *penall* and *ſatisfactory*: but (as *Solomon* ſaith, *Prov.* 21. 15,) *It is ioy to the iuſt to do iudgement*, and *Iob that he put on righteouſnes and it covered him, and iudgement was a robe and Diademe unto him, Iob.* 29. So generally when the heart is renued by *grace*, and brought to an inward and habituall *conformity* with the Law of *God*, wayes of *righteouſnes* and *holines*, are wayes of *pleaſure*, and of intire contentment. Much more then

muſt

muſt it needs be conceived; that the *Lord Chriſt*, being full of *grace* and *truth*, and having the *Spirit* without meaſure (as the *Scripture* witneſſeth) and not the leaſt *reluctation* in the frame of his Heart and ſoule againſt any *holy Commandement* or way of *God*, tooke very high and rich contentment, in all thoſe wayes of *holineſſe*, wherein hee walked, and exerciſed himſelfe all his dayes: yet is it not denyed in all this, but that this *active obedience* of *Chriſt*, may in ſome *ſence* and *reſpect*, be called *ſatisfactory* too, *viz.* as concurring and falling in with its *influence* into the *blood* or *death* of *Chriſt*, but not in and by it ſelfe. And this our *Saviour* himſelfe teacheth, *John* 12.24. *Except the corne of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone:* that is, *Chriſt* by his *active obedience*, and the *righteouſneſſe* of his life, had *juſtified* none but himſelfe, without his death: but if it dye, (ſaith hee) *it bringeth forth much fruit*, that is, ſo *holy* and *righteous* a perſon as *Chriſt* was in his life, by his *death juſtifieth* many. Hence it is, that the *Scriptures* ſo frequently when they mention the *death* of *Chriſt*, for the *redemption*, or *expiation* of the *ſinnes* of men, ſtill mention his *holineſſe* or the *righteouſnes* of his life with it. *For Chriſt alſo hath ſuffered for ſinnes, the JUST for the unjuſt*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. So 1 *Pet.* 1 18. 19. *knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, &c. but with the precious bloud of Chriſt, as of a Lamb undefiled, and without ſpot:* See *Heb.* 9. 14. and 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. 22. even as thoſe qualifications, of age, Sex, ſpotleſſenes, ſoundneſſe *&c.* required in the *legall ſacrifices*, were *expiatory* (in their kind.) when the *Beaſt* came to be offreed and ſlaine, but not before.

Thirdly (and laſtly, and which is of the worſt, and indeed of deſperate conſequence) by dividing the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt* into parts, he utterly deſtroyes and aboliſheth the infiniteneſſe thereof. For that which may be divided, muſt needs be finite: and that which is but the part of another, cannot it ſelfe be infinite. And

as

as certaine it is, that that whose parts are finite, cannot it selfe be infinite. If hee will maintaine the *active* part of *Christs satisfaction* (as his *Rhetoricall expression* is) to be infinite (which is the more consonant to his *principles*) why might not the *sinnes* of the *world*, as well of *commission*, as *omission*, have beene fully *expiated*, and taken away thereby? Certainly no *sinne*, nor *sinnes*, can require more then an *infinite satisfaction*. And if this *active satisfaction* be *infinite*, and consequently *sufficient* to take away the *sinnes* of the *world*: what necessitie can there be conceived of the *passive satisfaction*, if the worke and intent thereof be otherwise performed. I *doe not frustrate the grace of God (saith Paul) for if righteousnes be by the Law, then Christ is dead in vaine. Gal.* 2. 21. It is as true, concerning the *Law* performed by *Christ*, as by men themselves: if the *righteousnes* or *justification* of the *world be by Christs active obedience*, and performance of the *Law*, his *death* must be in vaine. If I doe not lay on loade upon Mr. *W.* here, and heate the *furnace* of my censure seven times hotter then ordinary, let him say that he scap'd a scouring, when time was.

My last labour (in this my Replye) is to vindicate the testimonies, produced by me out of severall *Authors*, as well ancient and moderne, for the further establishing and confirmation, of the *Imputation* of *Faith* in a direct and *proper sence*, in those controverted passages of the *Apostle*, *Rom.* 4. And here had we not to doe with men of wilfull and *importune spirits*, that conceit they have a dispensation from the *Figure Metalepsis*, to kick the nominative case and the *verb* out of doors; the bare recitall and laying downe the sayings themselves, were an abundant *vindication* of them in that behalfe. Or if wee had to do with a man that would stand his ground, and owne his owne *opinion* when it is at the best, this labour might be spared altogether. For Mr. *W.* (as hath beene more then once observed) hath more then

once

once ratified and ſealed to that very *interpretation*, for the ratification whereof theſe teſtimonies are brought forth by me. But his infirmity is, *Fluctuation*,

Nunc hùc, nunc illuc, exemplo nubis aquoſa. that is,

Much like a Wateriſh cloud, which now is here,
And by and by the windes will have it there.

Howſoever, I ſhall be very ſuccinct and briefe in my demonſtrations, being full of confidence, that every man that is not Mr. *W.* will be very eaſily ſatisfied in the point. Concerning theſe teſtimonies in generall, I deſire to propound but this one conſideration, to any reaſonable and conſidering man: whether it bee ſo much as tollerably credible, or probable in the leaſt and loweſt degree of probability, that ſo many learned *Interpreters*, one ſucceeding other thorough ſo many generations, and undertaking to expound a *Scripture* which they conceived to be figurative and *tropicall*, nay (as Mr. *W.* contends for) *hypertropicall*, where there ſhould bee *figure* upon *figure*, and *trope* upon *trope*, ſhould none of them give warning, or ſo much as take notice of any *tropicall* expreſſion, but deliver their mindes and judgements concerning the places, in the very ſame terme, and word, wherein the *trope* upon *trope*, ſhould lye.

Credat Iudæus Apella, Nonego.

that is,

This let the circumciſed *Iew*,
Beleeve, inſtead of me, for true:

Eſpecially conſidering that it is the manner of *Interpreters*, when they came to any *tropicall* and *figurative expreſſion* ſo conceived and apprehended by them, though the *figure* be ten times more *obvious* (then it can be in the *Scriptures* controverted, if there were any)

yet either to give notice of the *figure* by Name, or at leaſt to ſet downe in more plaine and *expreſſe* words, what is meant by the *figurative* expreſſion in the *Scriptures*: neither of which is done, by any of the *Authors* cited by mee upon thoſe places; but ſtill, that which *Paul* ſaith was *imputed* to *Abraham*, *viz.* his *beleeving God*, or his *Faith*, the ſame ſay theſe *interpreters* alſo: yea ſome of them *emphatically*, ſeeking (as it were) to bind their *Reader* to the very word and terme of *Faith*, which the *Apoſtle* uſeth, and not ſuffering them to caſt about in their mindes or thoughts, for any other thing. As in the teſtimony cited from *Bucer*: *Abraham fidem habuit Iehova, &c.* that is, *Abraham beleeved God, and it was imputed to him for righteouſnes*, that is (ſaith *Bucer*) hee *accounted this* FAITH, *or* BELEEVING *to him for righteouſnes*. If he had ever once imagined, the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* to have beene that, which *was imputed to Abraham for righteouſnes*, and not *Abrahams faith* in a *proper ſence*, would he have expreſſed himſelfe in ſuch a manner? So in that cited from *Bullinger*: *Concredidit ſe Abraham Deo &c.* that is, *Abraham* committed himſelfe unto *God* by *beleeving*, *& illud ipſum &c.* that is, that VERY SAME THING *was imputed to him for righteouſnes*. He that will here by *illud ipſum*, that VERY SAME THING underſtand the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, muſt ſeeke his *ſubſtantive* to his *adjective* hee knowes not where, and when he hath found it, will break poore *Priſcians* head with it too. Againe in that other *teſtimony* cited from the ſame *Author*, upon *Gal.* 3.6. *imputatum eſt ei &c. hoc eſt*, ILLA IPSA ABRAHÆ FIDES, *ipſi ad juſtitiam imputatum eſt*, that is, *it was imputed to him for righteouſnes*: that is, this very SELFE SAME FAITH OF ABRAHAM, was *imputed to him for righteouſnes*. Surely though Mr. *W.* makes bold, to underſtand by *faith*, the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt* (where he pleaſeth) yet by the *Faith* of *Abraham*, he will not adventure to underſtand the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, leaſt hee ſhould ſinne againſt the

the *reputation* and credit of his owne underſtanding too farre. In theſe and ſundry other teſtimonies yet remaining a man of very reaſonable apprehenſion cannot but conceive, that the *Authors*, with as much *anxiety* and warines of *ſpeech*, as well they could uſe, excluded all other things whatſoever, (without exception) from this *imputation*, but onely that VERY SELFE SAME FAITH of *Abraham*, in the *proper literall*, and moſt uſuall and *obvious ſence* and *ſignification*. This for the firſt demonſtration, which concerns the *teſtimonies* in generall, whereby it appeares, through and through all that thick miſt of wordes and paſſion which Mr. *W.* hath caſt upon it to obſcure and darken it, that the *Authors* generally by me alledged upon theſe *Scriptures*, did not underſtand the *word*, FAITH, or BELEEVING, in a *tropicall* or *metaleptickall ſence*, for the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, but in a *proper*, plaine, and *direct ſence*, for that *grace* or *act* of *Faith*, by which *Abraham* through the *worke* and aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt* beleeved in *God*.

The latter demonſtration, will not (I take it) extend ſo far as the former did, to include all the *teſtimonies* without exception: but as farre as it will reach, which is to many of them, it makes the matter greater then *contradiction*; that their *Authors* in their *commentaries* and *expoſitions*, could not poſſibly take the word *Faith*, or BELEEVING in a *figurative* or *metaleptickall ſence*, but in a *proper*. The demonſtration is this: becauſe the *word* FAITH, taken in a *figurative ſence* for the *righteouſneſſe* of *Chriſt*, will make them ſpeake partly manifeſt and open *blaſphemy*, partly moſt ridiculouſly and abſurdly: As for example, in that cited from *Luther*, on *Gal.* 3. 6. *Deus reputat iſtam* IMPERFECTAM FIDEM *&c.* that is, *God* for *Chriſts* ſake, in whom I have begun to *beleeve*, *accounts* this IMPERFECT FAITH, for *perfect righteouſnes*: If by *FAITH* here, we underſtand the *righteouſnes* of *Chriſt*, and not *Faith* properly, we make *Luther* an execrable *Blaſphemer*: for then he calls the *righ-*

teousneſſe of *Chriſt*, an *imperfect righteousnes*. So in that of *Illyricus*, *Mendica illa fides*, *&c.* that is, that SAME BEGGERLY FAITH, apprehending the *righteousnes* of *Chriſt*, was *imputed* unto him, inſtead of his owne *righteousneſſe*. If here by the *word*, *Faith*, wee ſhall underſtand the *righteousnes* of *Chriſt*, wee make this *Author* firſt to ſpeake abhominable *blaſphemy*, in calling the *righteousnes* of *Chriſt*, a beggerly *righteousnes*: and ſecondly moſt ridiculouſly and abſurdly, in ſaying, the *righteouſneſſe* of *Chriſt* apprehending the *righteousnes of Chriſt*, was *imputed* unto him *&c.* So in that of *Calvin*. *Fides reputatur in juſtitiam, non quòd ullum à nobis meritum afferat &c.* that is, *Faith is imputed* for *righteousnes*, not becauſe it brings any merit from us, but becauſe it apprehends the *goodneſſe* of *God*. If by *Faith* here, which this *Author* affirmeth to be *imputed* for *righteousnes*, we ſhall underſtand the *righteousnes* of *Chriſt*: then we muſt ſuppoſe him to give this *reaſon*, why this *righteouſneſſe* of *Chriſt* ſhould be *imputed* to us for *righteouſnes*, *viz.* becauſe it brings no merit with it from us, but becauſe it apprehends the *goodnes* of *God*, both which are very *ridiculous* (if the one be not *blaſphemous*.) I might include many other of the *teſtimonies* within the compaſſe of this demonſtration: but I judge by my ſelfe, that my *Reader* would gladly be at his journeyes end. Wherefore if „ Mr. *W.* who ſo confidently affirm's, that of all the *te-* „ *ſtimonies* by me cited, there is not one that affirmes, „ that *Faith* (taken in a *proper ſence*) is *imputed* for *righ-* „ *teouſnes*, and calls me the moſt odious example of *im-* „ *pudency* and folly that can be *imagined*, for ſaying the contrary, will willingly and patiently from his own pen, be content to beare himſelf the *imputation* of this odious exemplarineſſe both in *impudency* and *folly*, I conceive it may doe him much good for the time to come: but my pen is mercifull, and ſhall caſt no ſuch *imputation* upon him, though hee deſerves it. And for thoſe bloody crimes, of *forgery* and *falſe ſubornation* of *witneſſes*, Mr. *W.* is

W. is pleaſed out of his lenity and clemency, to content himſelfe with the bare charge and accuſation: but doth not profecute his inditement, nor once goeth about to prove, that I have forged ſo much as the leaſt jot, or title in any of the *teſtimonies* alledged by me, fearing (it ſeemes) that he ſhould make no earnings of that labour.

I muſt yet adde a little, concerning ſome rare paſſages in the very laſt *page*, of his *diſcourſe*. This is one ſpeciall commendation of his *tragicall choler*, that it doth not in *extremo actu deficere*, faile or faint in the laſt act, but is in very good plight and liking, and brings forth more fruit, then at the firſt. He firſt gravely admoniſheth all indifferent *Readers*, and zealous Chriſtians, of two grand duties: firſt to take heed to themſelves, and then to admoniſh others, to have no fellowſhip with ſo openly profeſt *Socinian Heretiques*, *&c.* Next hee calls the opinion I maintaine a wicked and *blaſphemous hereſie*: then he aggravates an *offence* that is not, by affirming that which was not, *viz.* our perſiſting in our "peſtilent *hereſie*, notwithſtanding many admonitions "given by divers *grave* and *learned Divines*, and often "publique *confutations* and *cenſures &c.* (The man had as good have told me, that the man in the moone drinks *Claret* I know as much of the one, as of the other) Next, he *methodically* proceeds, to make a fierce outcry "againſt me, as a *deſperate man, wilfully, and againſt the* "*knowne light, and againſt my owne conſcience*, proclaiming *Luther*, *Calvin*, *&c.* to be of my opinion &c. and ſo hee goeth on beating, and teering himſelfe, like a wild *Bull* in a Net, Foaming out his owne ſhame (after his wonted manner) till he hath *ſatiated* himſelfe, with railing, and ſpeaking evill, both of *perſons* and *things*, which he knoweth not: Onely in the end and *cataſtrophe* of his *tragique piece* as if he envied *Apuleius*, *his merry tales of his golden Aſſe*, or *Ovid. his pleaſant Fables in his Metamorphoſis*: he contrives a *Gorgonean fiction*, with much *curioſity*, and *quaintnes*, of device:

" *How I and my followers, proclaiming our pedigree from*
" *the Father of liers, ſhould make falſe reports. How that*
" *Mr.* Goodwin *did confute and confound him, (whereas*
" *he can do both himſelfe, to himſelfe) and did mightily*
" *convince him by the power of his Arguments; and (as*
" *followes in his moſt hideous and piteous complaint.)*

Hoc animis natum, inventumq́, Poema juvandis.

that is,

This Poem (doubtleſſe) bred was, and contriv'd,
To pleaſe the fancies of men much agriev'd.

For my part—— *Eſſe canes utero ſub virginis, eſſe Chimeram,*
Sphyngáq́, et Harpyas, ſerpentiferoſq́, Gigantes,
Centimanumq́ Gygem, tergeminumq́ canem;
Hæc ego cuncta prius &c, that is,

I ſooner ſhall beleeve, that bawling Dogs,
Are in the Virgins bellie, and thoſe hobbs,
Chimera hight and Sphynx, that monſter rare,
With ravening Harpyes, and that Gyants are;
Like Serpents footed, and that Gyges had
An hundred hands, and Cerb'rus triple head.

" I confeſſe, men may be fooliſh, and take *pleaſure* in
the vanity of their *tongues*, and ſending abroad reports of
ſtrange *ſhapes* and *figures*, into the world: but for thoſe
" in whoſe faces Mr. *W.* ſpits out his gall, calling them,
" *rude, impudent*, & *unmannerly: I* fully beleeve they have
" ſo much of their *wits* yet unſhaken, and remaining, as
is ſufficient to preſerve them from any ſuch *ridiculous ex-*
orbitance of *tongue*, as the *pen* of *exorbitancie* here would
faſten upon them. Notwithſtanding, if any of them
have committed that high Treaſon, they here ſtand
charged

charged with, againſt the princely *dignity* of Mr. *Ws. reputation*; he ſhall do well to call them to account for it. It were no hard matter for him to trace the *report* by the *footſteps*, and follow it home to the very *mouth*, out of which it firſt *iſſued*: and I beleeve, before he came to the fourth or fift man, the *Author* would be found. In the meane ſeaſon (if Mr. *W.* pleaſe) my Books, to his, that it was ſome of his owne followers or friends (that I do not ſay of his Cloath too) and not mine, that made the wooden *Image* he ſpeaks of: though neither can *I* thinke, but that he hath beſtowed much coſt in *garniſhing*, and *poliſhing* it himſelfe, and that when it came, it came but rough into his hands, in compariſon of thoſe goodly *ornaments* of *Rhetorique*, which he hath now put upon it. *Facile eſt inventis addere*, that is, Once invented, ſoone augmented.

From *curſing* and *reviling*, he falls to *praying*, that *God* would defend his *Church* and *People*, from ſuch *ſpirits* (which no where moleſt or hurt them) and thinking it high time to *repent* at laſt, *he gives glory to God*: I remember *Squire*, when he clap'd poyſon upon the pummel of Queene *Elizabeths* Saddle, to take away her *life*, cried out alowd, *God ſave the Queene*. But if Mr. *W.* indeed, deſires to give *glory* to *God*, he muſt repent of his forged *accuſations*, his ſlanderous *reports*, of his *rage* and *fiercenеſſe*, againſt thoſe that never wronged him in the leaſt *matter*: he muſt *retract* and *cancell* the greateſt part of what he hath ſent abroad in this his ſcandalous *Pamphlet*, *viz.* all the palpable *errors* and *untruths* therein, whoſe name may be called *Legion*, for they are many. And for this ſo *ſolemn*, *anxious*, and *laborious* an acquitting himſelfe, from joyning or ſubmitting to the *truth*, he might have ſpared it, without much danger of prejudice to him. For thoſe that know him (as who doth not?) know him to have *Pelida ſtomachum cedere neſcij*, *i.* Achilles ſtomack ſtout, that knowes not how to yield, no more to *truth* then to *error*, but onely

to

to what hath already ſurprized his *fancie* and *imagination*.

The *Lord* who alone is the giver of new hearts, unto *men*, give him a *heart* to do all this, and whatſoever beſides belongs to his peace, or may through him, tend to advance the glorious *Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt*, in the world. If he ſhall yet write more Bookes againſt me, if they be not too big, I will lay them upon my ſhoulder (as *Iob* ſpeaketh) but here make him a *ſolemne promiſe*, that I will never *anti-pamphlet* with him more. If he be *wilfull* and reſolved to have the laſt word, *I* ſhall not envy him the *glory* and *priveledge* of a *skonld*.

FINIS

To the Bodleian Library
from E. S. Dodgson,
19 June, 1907.